

Unsheathing the Arrowhead

in Defense of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān

By

Sa'd ibn Ḍhaydān al-Subay'ī

Transliteration key

أ - 'ā	د - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'a
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

Contents

Preface by ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sa‘īd	11
The Virtues and Merits of Mu‘āwiyah	15
1. His Islam	15
2. His Companionship	23
3. He was a Scribe of the Prophet ﷺ	24
4. The Praise of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi‘īn	26
Praise for him by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his Senior Companions	29
The Pledge of Allegiance to Mu‘āwiyah by Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, the Members of Their Household, and the Rest of the Ṣaḥābah	33
The Narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt from Mu‘āwiyah	39
Some of the Incidents From His Life	55
Regarding the Authentic Ḥadīth, “The Rebellious Party Will Kill ‘Ammār,” and Relating it to Other Texts	63
Referencing the Ḥadīth of Abū Bakrah, “Indeed This Son of Mine is a Sayyid.”	77
The First Chain	78
The Second Chain	79
The Third Chain	80
The Fourth Chain	80
The Fifth Chain	81
The Sixth Chain	81
The Seventh Chain	81
The Eighth Chain	82
The Ninth Chain	82
As for the Narrations from Anas	83
As for the Narration of Umm Salamah	84
As for the Mursal Narration	84
Analysis of This Ḥadīth	85
Establishing That Ḥasan Heard From Abū Bakrah	91
The First Narration	96
The Second Narration	99
The Third Narration	102

The Fourth Narration	105
Commenting on the Authenticity of This Ḥadīth	108
Dealing With the Corroboratory Narrations	109
Dealing With the Narrations That Corroborate This Ḥadīth Specifically	111
The Narration of Jābir	111
The Narration of Anas	114
Regarding Those Scholars Who Have Authenticated This Narration	117
Authors Preface	119
Chapter One	129
Responding to Those Aḥādīth Which Have Been Quoted in Criticism of Mu‘āwiyah	129
The Unreliable and Fabricated Narrations That Have Been Quoted in Criticism of Mu‘āwiyah	131
The First Narration: If you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him!	131
As for the First Chain	133
As for the Second Chain	134
As for the Third Chain	135
As for the Fourth Chain	137
As for the Fifth Chain	138
As for the Sixth Chain	139
As for the Seventh Chain	140
The Second Narration: May Allah curse the rider, and the leader, and the driver.	146
The Narration of Saḥīnah:	146
The Narration of Ḥasan	147
The Narration of Barā’ ibn ‘Azīb	149
The narration of ‘Āṣim al-Laythī	155
The Narration of Ibn ‘Umar	157
The Narration of Muhājir ibn Qunfudh	159
The Third Narration: There shall enter upon you, from this mountain pass, a man who will die upon other than my religion.	161
Corroboration of This Narration Through Another Chain	164

The Fourth Narration: The first to change my Sunnah is a man from Banū Umayyah.	171
This Narration Has Two Defects	171
The Fifth Narration: I have been commanded to kill those who are disloyal, those who are unjust, and those who defect.	173
The First Chain	173
The Second Chain	174
The Third Chain	175
The Fourth Chain	175
The Fifth Chain	175
The Sixth Chain	176
The Seventh Chain	176
The Eighth Chain	177
The Ninth Chain	177
The Tenth Chain	177
The Eleventh Chain	178
The Twelfth Chain	179
The Thirteenth Chain	179
The Fourteenth Chain	179
The Fifteenth Chain	180
The Sixteenth Chain	181
The Sixth Narration: Indeed the killer of ‘Ammār and his marauder are in the fire.	182
Firstly, the Narration Cannot be Correctly Established	182
Secondly, it Still Does Not Incriminate Mu‘āwiyah	187
The Aḥādīth Which are Authentic But Do Not Refer to Mu‘āwiyah	189
The First Narration: The destruction of my ummah will be at the hands of youngsters from Quraysh.	189
The Second Narration: I was playing with children when Allah’s Messenger ﷺ happened to pass by (us)... ”	193
The Third Narration: The Khilāfah will last thirty years, and then it will become a cruel monarchy.	196

The Fourth Narration: Wayḥ ‘Ammār, the rebellious party will kill him, he is calling them to Paradise and they are calling him to the Fire.	201
The Fifth Narration: There will take charge of your affairs after me men who will introduce to you that which you disapprove...	210
The First Defect	211
The Second Defect	213
The Third Defect	213
The Sixth Narration: It is the covenant of the unlettered Prophet with me, that none shall love me except a believer and none shall hate me except a hypocrite.	214
Chapter Two	223
Responding to the Narrations That Have Been Declared Weak, Which Indicate Virtue for Mu‘āwiyah	223
The First Narration: O Allah, make him a guide, rightly-guided and guide (others) through him.	229
The First Alledged Defect	230
The Second Alledged Defect	233
The Third Alledged Defect	233
The Fourth Alledged Defect	234
The Fifth Alledged Defect	235
The Sixth Alledged Defect	236
The Seventh Alledged Defect	237
The Eighth Alledged Defect	237
The Ninth Alledged Defect	237
The Second Narration: The narration of Umm Haram regarding the naval expedition	238
The First Alledged Defect	239
The Second Alledged Defect	241
Opinions of the Scholars Regarding Narrating From the People of Innovation	241
The First Opinion	241
The Second Opinion	243
The Third Opinion	246
The Third Alledged Defect	253

The Third Narration: Indeed this son of mine is a Sayyid	259
The First Alledged Defect	261
The Second Alledged Defect	262
The Third Alledged Defect	262
The Fourth Alledged Defect	268
Chapter Three	271
Dealing with the Fabrications that Have been Invented about Mu'āwiyah	271
The First Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Traded in Alcohol	272
The Second Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Traded in Usury	275
The Third Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Sold Idols to the People of India	278
The Fourth Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Took False Oaths, and the Messenger ﷺ Exposed his Lies	280
The Fifth Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Killed Twenty of the Participants of Badr at Šiffīn	282
The Sixth Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Poisoned Ḥasan ibn 'Alī	286
The Seventh Allegation: Mu'āwiyah Killed 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd	289
The Eighth Allegation: Mu'āwiyah's Killing of Ḥujr Ibn 'Adī	291
The Ninth Allegation: The Allegation of Mu'āwiyah Killing al-Ashtar Mālīk Ibn al-Ḥārith al-Nakha'ī	293
The Tenth Allegation : The Allegation That Mu'āwiyah Instituted the Cursing of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib	295
The Eleventh Allegation: The Condemnation of Mu'āwiyah by Abū Bakrah, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and al-Aswad ibn Yazīd	299
Chapter Four	309
The Virtues and Merits of Mu'āwiyah	309
General Texts	309
Specific Texts	310
Among His Merits is That He Was a Scribe of the Prophet ﷺ	314
Among His Merits is That He is the Uncle of the Believers	316

Among His Merits is That He Was the Best of Monarchs	319
The Praise of the Earliest Muslims for Mu'āwiyah	319
Statements of the Earliest Muslims Regarding Those Who Revile Mu'āwiyah	324
Chapter Five	329
The Consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah on Remaining Silent on What Occurred Between the Ṣaḥābah	329

Preface

by the Esteemed Shaykh and Muḥaddith 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sa'd

All praise belongs to Allah; we praise Him and seek His divine aid and forgiveness, and we seek refuge in Allah from the wickedness of our souls and the evils of our actions. He whom Allah has guided none shall misguide; and he whom Allah has misguided there shall be no guide for him. I testify that there is none worthy of worship besides Allah, alone, and there is no partner with him; as I testify that Muḥammad is His slave and messenger.

As for what follows, indeed Allah ﷻ has perfected for us the religion and completed upon us the grace; as He says: “This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed upon you My grace; and I am pleased for you with Islam as your religion.”¹ Therefore, all that we require for our religious and worldly affairs has its explanation in the Book of our Rabb and in the Sunnah of our Prophet ﷺ, Allah says: “We have sent down to you the Book to make clear every affair; and as guidance, mercy and glad-tidings to the Muslims.”²

Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥātim, the scribe of al-Bukhārī, said:

I heard Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī saying, “I do not know of anything which is needed except that it is in the Book of Allah and the Sunnah,” so I said to him, “is it possible to know of it all?” and he replied, “Yes!”³

Al-Shāṭibī, in *al-I'tisām* (1/64), has said:

Indeed the sharī'ah has come complete, it does not bear the capacity for

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89

3 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* (12/412); and Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥātim, the scribe of al-Bukhārī, has a book called *Shamā'il al-Bukhārī* which al-Dhahabī describes as being a large compilation. Ibn Ḥajar has quoted his chain of transmission to this particular book in *Taghliq al-Ta'līq* (5/386).

additions [to it] nor deductions [from it]; since Allah Almighty has said with regards to it [the sharīah]: “This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed upon you My grace; and I am pleased for you with Islam as your religion.”¹

And in the narration of ‘Irbāḍ ibn Sāriyah رضي الله عنه it appears:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ delivered to us an admonition which caused the eyes to flow and the hearts to tremble and we said, “O Messenger of Allah ﷺ this admonition seems as if it is one of farewell so what do you advise us with?” He said, “I have left you on the clear path, its night is like its day, none deviates from it after me except one who is destined for destruction. Those who live after me shall see many disagreements, so you must take hold on to what you know of my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the rightly guided khulafā’ after me...”

It has been established that the Prophet ﷺ did not depart from this world except that he explained all that is required of the affairs of religion and of the world; and there is no difference of opinion on this matter among the Ahl al-Sunnah. If that is such then the result of what the *Mubtadi‘* [innovator] says or promotes by merely adopting such a view, is that the sharīah was incomplete and there remains some affairs that require readdressing or that there is room for supplementing what is missing. Since it would not be necessary for him – if he believed in the completion and perfection of the sharīah in every way – to innovate, nor would he need to readdress or assume to supplement that which he conceives missing; and one who says this – that there is room for improvement to the sharīah – is deviated from the straight path.

Therefore, it is upon every person who wishes to find out about any matter or ruling that he refers it to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah, which includes what relates to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه and what has been said regarding him.

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

Indeed this matter is a great matter and an intricate one at that. Some people have indulged in it and it brought them to *Naṣb* [anti-‘Alī sentiments]; whilst others have been led to *Tashayyu’* and *Rafḍ* [anti-Ṣaḥabah sentiments]. The path from both of these problems is to refer everything to the Sunnah; since in it is sufficient explanation and information for those who seek the truth and salvation.

If one who speaks of this matter were to refer to what al-Bukhārī has related (Ḥadīth: 2704) from the narration of Abū Mūsā, Isrā’īl, from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “This son of mine is a *Sayyid* [noble/chief/leader] and I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation, through him, between two groups of the Muslims,” it would have sufficed. The explanation of the points of reflection from this ḥadīth will follow in this article with Allah’s permission.

The Prophet ﷺ has also elaborated on his [Mu‘āwiyah’s] status whilst he was a young man (that was very soon after his embracing Islam), then after he had matured in age and thereafter when he reached old age until he departed from this world; the details of all of this follow, with Allah’s permission.

I have perused what has been written by our son, Shaykh Sa’d ibn Ḍaydān al-Subay’ī with regards to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and in defence of him; and I have considered him to have excelled and benefitted in what he has written. He has mentioned the evidences that indicate the high status of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well as mentioning the scholarly writings in defence of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, I pray that Allah rewards him well and blesses him.

The Virtues and Merits of Mu'āwiyah

The elaboration of this will be in line with the following points:

1. His Islam

There is no disagreement among the scholars regarding the Islam of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه. All that they have differed on was the time of his accepting Islam as some have said it was in the year of Ḥudaybiyyah [6 A.H.], others said the year following that, and yet others have said it was after the conquest of Makkah [8A.H.]; whilst he was still a young man and he was around eighteen years of age at the time.¹

I say that this is the foundation of all virtues; and the scale by which all people ought to be measured as it is well known. Allah Almighty says: “Indeed the only religion [acceptable] by Allah is Islam...”² and He also says: “Whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it shall never be accepted from him...”³ and He says: “Say: with the grace of Allah and His mercy in this let them rejoice; it is better than what they amass.”⁴

If it is said that his Islam was invalid and he merely accepted Islam out of hypocrisy, then I say that the response to that is threefold.

Firstly, that which has come by way of textual statements from the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم, they clearly state the Islam of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه and these texts are of two categories:

- i. Specific texts
- ii. General texts

1 The biography of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه may be accessed from the *Tārīkh* of Ibn 'Asākir as he has listed the opinions of the various scholars regarding this.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 19

3 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 85

4 Sūrah Yūnus: 58

As for the specific texts, then Muslim has related (Ḥadīth: 1480) by way of Mālik ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yazīd, *Mawlā* [freed slave] of al-Aswad ibn Sufyān, from Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, from Fāṭimah bint Qays رضي الله عنها – and then he mentioned an incident – in it she says:

When I became lawful [for marriage] I mentioned to him [the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم] that both Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and Abū Jahm have both proposed for me [in marriage] so the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “As for Abu Jahm he does not put his staff down from his shoulder, and as for Mu‘āwiyah he is destitute and he does not have much wealth; marry Usāmah ibn Zayd [instead]...”

In this narration there is mention of the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه and a refutation on those who accuse him of hypocrisy since the extent of the Prophet’s صلى الله عليه وسلم communication with Fāṭimah bint Qays was that he did not have wealth and if there had been any point of concern regarding his Islam the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم would have brought this to the attention of Fāṭimah bint Qays and he would not have hidden this; and in this is praise for Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه in his religion, and this was during his early stages of life and at the early period of his Islam.

After the demise of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم he went to the region of *al-Shām* [Greater Syria] as a soldier and warrior; and this was during the era of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه; and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه appointed him as the leader of the troops who were sent as reinforcements to al-Shām.

Thereafter, he was tasked with governing areas of al-Shām by ‘Umar رضي الله عنه; and this was after the demise of his own brother Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān – as will be elaborated on later – and he remained in that position until ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه became the Khalīfah, and he was then tasked with the responsibility of governing the entire region of al-Shām. All of this is a clear demonstration of his situation during his years of youth.

As for his situation after maturing in age, then it has been explained by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ as narrated by al-Bukhārī (Ḥadīth: 2704) from the narration of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī who said that he heard Abū Bakrah saying that he had seen the Messenger of Allah ﷺ – and Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was at his side – and he was saying:

This son of mine is a Sayyid [noble/chief/leader] and I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation, through him, between two great groups of the Muslims.

Al-Bukhārī has repeatedly mentioned this narration at various places in his compilation (Ḥadīths: 3629,3747,7109)

This Ḥadīth contains of the great merits of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه that he is a Sayyid and the sign of that is his abdication of the Khilāfah [in favour of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه]. In this ḥadīth there is also a description of the parties that were with Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that they are both Muslims; further it includes merit and praise for Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه since the Prophet ﷺ praised the action of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه – abdicating in favour of Mu‘āwiyah - and were Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه not fit for leadership the Prophet ﷺ would not have praised that reconciliation and Ḥasan’s رضي الله عنه abdication in favour of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah said:

The prophetic statement, “... two parties from the Muslims,” impresses us greatly.¹

Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī stated:

The reason for being impressed is that the Prophet ﷺ called both parties Muslims. And this narration is a prediction from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ as to what will happen with Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه after the

1 It has been narrated by Ya‘qūb ibn Sufyān in his *Tārīkh* and Sa‘īd ibn Manṣūr as quoted by Ibn Ḥajar in *Fath al-Bārī* (13/66)

demise of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام; and his handing over the rule to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān عليه السلام.

Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī عليه السلام has said in his sermon:

O people, indeed Allah has guided you by the first of us, and has saved your blood by the last of us; and this matter in which Mu‘āwiyah and I have differed in is either the right of an individual who was more deserving of it than me, or it is a right belonging to me which I have forgone for Mu‘āwiyah with the intention of reconciliation among Muslims and preserving their blood [from being spilt], and I know not whether it is a trial for you or an enjoyment for a period of time.¹

Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī has written in his book, *Ma‘ālim al-Sunan* (7/37), under the commentary of this ḥadīth:

The confirmation of this prediction came to being on account of the reconciliation between the people of Iraq and the people of al-Shām, and his [Ḥasan’s] withdrawing from the matter [of leadership], out of fear of the spilling of blood and that year was referred to as the year of collectiveness [or unity]. Furthermore, in the narration is a proof that none of the parties had exited the fold of Islam on account of what happened between them, whether verbally or physically, since the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم has called them both Muslims. This is the way to deal with every person who does *Ta’wīl* [scholarly interpretation] by any view or stance that he calls towards if the basis of his interpretation is vagueness and potential uncertainty, even if such a person is error in that matter. It is known that one of the parties was in the right and the other was mistaken.²

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned in his *Fatāwā* (35/70):

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم praised Ḥasan on account of this settlement which

1 *Al-I’tiqād* by al-Bayhaqī

2 Al-Baghawī has stated something similar in *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* (14/136)

came about at his hands, and called him a Sayyid for that sake; that is due to the action of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه being beloved to Allah and His Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم, and Allah and His Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم are pleased with it. Were the in-fighting that occurred between the Muslims that which Allah and His Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم instructed with, this would not have been the case [praising the action of Ḥasan]; then in fact Ḥasan would have omitted a necessary responsibility, or that which was more beloved to Allah. However, this narration is sound and unambiguous in expounding that what Ḥasan did was praiseworthy and pleasing to Allah and His Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم.”

What could be further extracted from the ḥadīth is to avoid the discussions surrounding this *fitnah* [communal strife] and to refrain from attacking Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and those with him, since the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم praised the reconciliation and he praised Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه at whose hands this reconciliation came about. So when someone attacks Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and those with him, it undermines the basis of the reconciliation which the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم praised. Furthermore, in order for the results of this reconciliation to remain and continue it is necessary to avoid rekindling the causes which brought about the internal differences in the first place; among that being the attacks on Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and rather limiting oneself to what have been mentioned in the clear texts so that the effects of this reconciliation may still be preserved. Abū Dāwūd has named the chapter in his *Sunan* under which this ḥadīth is mentioned, “the chapter of avoiding speaking about the *fitnah*,” (5/211) and it is as if he is indicating to what has just been mentioned – and Allah knows best – and no doubt that is from his profound insight, may Allah have mercy on him.

As for his situation in his old age, then that has also been expounded upon by the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم as well as has been narrated by al-Bukhārī (Ḥadīth: 7222, 7223) and Muslim (Ḥadīth: 1821) from the narration of ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umayr, from Jābir ibn Samurah رضي الله عنه who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم saying: “The affair of the people with continue [to be elevated] for the duration of the leadership of twelve

men..." then he said something which was inaudible to me so I asked my father what did the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say and he said, "... all of them are from Quraysh."

This is the wording in Muslim who has also narrated it (821) by way of Ḥuṣayn from Jābir and the wording is:

Indeed this affair shall not expire until twelve khulafā' come to pass over them.

It also appears with a variant wording by way of Simāk, from Jābir:

Islam shall continue to be mighty until twelve khulafā' – and then he said something which I did not comprehend which I asked from my father what he said and he told me, "all of them shall be from Quraysh."

And in the wording of the narration by way of al-Sha'bī, from Jābir:

This affair shall remain strong and mighty through twelve khulafā'.

It has also been narrated by Muslim (1822) by way of 'Āmir ibn Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ who said that Jābir ibn Samurah had written to him with his slave, Nāfi', informing him of something that he heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ who said:

The religion will continue to be dominant until the emergence of the [final] hour; or there are twelve khulafā' over you, all of them from Quraysh.

So based on the apparent meaning of these narrations Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه is included since he was from the Quraysh and he ruled and the religion was mighty and dominant during his reign. So this narration clearly applies to him, more specifically the narration of al-Sha'bī and Simāk which describe Islam as being mighty and strong and the apparent meaning of this narration indicates that the strength, and might began with the first khalīfah after the Messenger

of Allah ﷺ, who is Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ until twelve khulafā' came to pass, which would include Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ among them; more specifically since he was granted the pledge of allegiance by all the Muslims and that year was titled the year of collectiveness or unity as is well known.

So, based on this, Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a legitimate khalīfah, and the religion during his reign was strong and mighty and this was on account of him ruling according to the sharī'ah and implementing the Sunnah; otherwise the religion would not have had might and strength, and Allah knows best.

Abū Zur'ah said:

'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ibrāhīm narrated to us – who said – al-Walīd narrated to us – who said – al-Awzā'ī said: “The era of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ witnessed many of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, among them: Sa'd, Usāmah, Jābir, ibn 'Umar, Zayd ibn Thābit, Maslamah ibn Makhlad, Abū Sa'īd, Rāfi' ibn Khadij, Abū Umāmah, Anas ibn Mālik and so many others who exceed to number we have mentioned by many times. They were lanterns of guidance, and vessels of knowledge; they witnessed the revelation of the Qur'ān and they took its interpretation from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. As for the generation that followed them with excellence – with the Will of Allah - from the successors they comprise of : al-Miswar ibn Makhramah, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Aswad ibn 'Abd Yaghūth, Sa'īd ibn al-Mūsāyyab, 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥayrīz and the likes of them who did not budge in maintaining the unity of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ.”¹

Al-Dhahabī said in his *Siyar* (3/132) :

It should suffice you that this is an individual who has been appointed by 'Umar and then 'Uthmān over a province – which is a frontier – and he excels in his duties and responsibilities, and his people are pleased with

1 *Tārīkh Abī Zur'ah* (pg 42-43)

his generosity and forbearance even though some may have experienced some inconvenience at his hand on occasion; and likewise that he should continue as a king, even though there were others from the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ who excel over him in virtue and piety. This is the man who ruled and led the world his ingenious intellect, unsurpassed forbearance, bountiful generosity, subtle cunningness and tactful decisions. He also has those matters for which he will stand before Allah to account for. He was extremely beloved by his people; he was a governor over al-Shām for twenty years, then he became the khalīfah for twenty years. During this period no one dared to lampoon him in his kingdom, to the contrary all nations drew close to him and he ruled over the Arabs and non-Arabs. His kingdom spanned over Arabia, Egypt, al-Shām, al-‘Irāq, Khūrasān [Central Asia], Persia, al-Jazīrah, Yemen and al-Maghrib [the Western Islamic regions] and other places as well.”

As for the general texts, then they will be listed as will follow.

Al-Bukhārī narrates (3608) from al-Ḥakam ibn Nāfi‘ - who said - Shu‘ayb narrated to us from al-Zuhrī - who said - Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān narrated to be that Abū Hurayrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

The [final] Hour shall not come until two groups fight each other; their call being one.

Muslim narrates (1065) by way of Qāsim ibn al-Faḍl - who said - Abū Naḍrah narrated to us from Abū Sa‘īd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

A faction will renegade at a time when there is division among the Muslims; and the party, among two parties, which is closer to the truth will fight them.

So in the narration of Abū Hurayrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is an explanation of what occurred between ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; and there is no doubt that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was

closer to the truth than anyone else, and it was also ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who fought against the Khawārij renegades. In this narration is also a clear indication of the Islam of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ since the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said that “... their call is one,” and that “the party closest to the truth among two parties,” would fight the defectors.

Al-Nawawī has said in his commentary of *Muslim* (7/168):

... and in it [the narration] is an unequivocal pronouncement that both parties were believers; and they do not, on account of their fighting, exit the religion neither are they described with *fiṣq* [flagrant sin]; and this is our stance [i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah].

Ibn Kathīr in his *Bidāyah* (10/513) states:

... and in it [the narration] is a ruling of Islam upon both parties, the people of al-Shām and the people of Iraq; not as is claimed by the Rāfiḍī group – the people of ignorance and deviation – who pronounce apostasy upon the people of al-Shām.

2. His Companionship

Al-Bukhārī has narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (3746) from Ḥasan ibn Bishr – who said – al-Mu‘āfā narrated to us from ‘Uthmān ibn al-Aswad, from ibn Abī Mulaykah who said:

Mu‘āwiyah prayed one *rak‘ah* [unit of prayer] of *witr* [odd-numbered evening prayer] and a *Mowla* [freed slave] of Ibn ‘Abbās was with him, so he came to Ibn ‘Abbās [telling him about Mu‘āwiyah] and he [Ibn ‘Abbās] said: “Leave him for indeed he has been in the companionship of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.”

I say that the companionship of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is well-known as is indicated by this narration and

others; and the status of companionship and its virtue is known from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah. From the very clear proofs for that is what is mentioned in the Qur’ān:

لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ ۖ أُولَٰئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مِّنَ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ
وَقَاتَلُوا ۖ وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَىٰ ۚ وَاللَّهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرٌ

Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought. But to all Allah has promised the best [reward]. And Allah, with what you do, is Acquainted.¹

This verse encompasses all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; those who spent and fought before the conquest of Makkah, and those who spent and fought after the conquest. All of them Allah has promised the “Best [reward]”, which is Paradise; and as has been explained earlier that the Islam of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was either before the conquest or after, regardless of when he is still included under the meaning of this verse.

3. He was a Scribe of the Prophet ﷺ

Aḥmad has narrated in his *Musnad* (1/291) from ‘Affān – who said – Abū ‘Awānah narrated to us – who said – Abū Ḥamzah narrated to us that he heard Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ saying:

I was a young boy running around with the other children when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ happened to approach us from behind us, I assumed that he did not seek anyone but me so I ran and hid behind a door of a house and I did not realise until suddenly he embraced me. He patted me between my shoulders and said, “go and call Mu‘āwiyah for me,” and he [Mu‘āwiyah] was his [the Prophet ﷺ] scribe, so I ran and said:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 10

“respond to the call of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ as he needs you.”

Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī narrated a similar narration in his *Musnad* (2746) by way of Hishām and Abū ‘Awānah, from Abū Ḥamzah al-Qaṣṣāb, from Ibn ‘Abbās.

The essential part of this narration is found in *Muslim* (2604) by way of Shu‘bah, from Abū Ḥamzah with the same wording except for the phrase “...he was his scribe...” although the narration of *Muslim* is more complete.¹

Abū Ḥamzah is named ‘Imrān al-Qaṣṣāb, and the most dominant view is that there is no harm in him in what he narrates as Aḥmad has said of him, “fair in Ḥadīth,” and the narration of Shu‘bah from him adds strength to him. Sufyān al-Thowrī has also said of him, “he was from the companions of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه,” and this indicates the well-known fact of his connection to Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and in this narration he explicitly mentions that he heard it from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه.

I say, the fact of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه being the scribe of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is something that is well-known among the scholars; and the fact that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ took him as a scribe for the revelation is a great merit and accolade for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

He was also a scribe for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Ya‘qūb ibn Sufyān says in *al-Ma‘rifah wal-Ta‘rīkh* (3/373):

Sulaymān has narrated to us – who said - ‘Umar ibn ‘Alī narrated to us from Hishām ibn ‘Urwah, from his father who said: “I entered upon Mu‘āwiyah and he asked me where is *al-Maslūl* [the name of a document]; and I told him it was with me. He then said, ‘By Allah, I had written it with my own hand. Abū Bakr was allocating a piece of land for al-Zubayr and I was recording it. Then ‘Umar approached and Abū Bakr took it and placed it in the fold of the mattress; and when he [‘Umar] entered he asked, “It seems as if you

1 The famous narration of ibn ‘Abbās in *‘Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*’ (1501) also mentions that the Prophet ﷺ took him [Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه] as a scribe and the discussion on that narration is well-known

are having a private discussion?” and Abū Bakr replied in the affirmative. So ‘Umar left and Abū Bakr brought out the book again and I completed it [i.e. writing the document].”

4. The Praise of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi‘īn

It appears in one of the wordings of the previously quoted narrations related by al-Bukhārī (3765) by way of ibn Abī Mulaykah, from the narration of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه questioning the Witr of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and Ibn ‘Abbās responded, “he is indeed a jurist.”

Al-Khallāl has narrated in *al-Sunnah* by way of Hushaym, from al-‘Awwām ibn Howshab, from Jabalah ibn Suḥaym who said:

I heard Ibn ‘Umar saying, “I have not seen anyone after the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم more tactful in leadership than Mu‘āwiyah,” it was said to him, “what about your father?” and he responded, “my father – may Allah have mercy on him – was superior to Mu‘āwiyah. However, Mu‘āwiyah was more tactful in leadership than him.”

Ma‘mar has related in his *Jāmi‘* (20985, from the printed *Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq) from Hammām ibn Munabbih, who heard Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه saying:

I have not seen any person who appeared to have been created for the role of kingship more than Mu‘āwiyah. People would come to him from far and wide; and he was never miserly, stingy, harsh or temperamental.

Al-Dhahabī has stated in *Tārīkh al-Islam* (2/544):

Busr ibn Sa‘īd narrates from Sa‘īd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ who said: “I have not seen anyone after ‘Uthmān who ruled with justice than the companion of this door – meaning Mu‘āwiyah.”

Abū Zur‘ah al-Dimishqī narrates in his *Tārīkh* (1/572) from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn

Ibrāhīm – who said – Ka‘b ibn Khudayj Abū Ḥārithah narrated to me – Abū Zur‘ah said:

I have seen Abū Ḥārithah and sat in his company and he was a pious shaykh [narrator of ḥadīth] – who said - ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muṣ‘ab ibn Thābit narrated to us, from Hishām ibn ‘Urwah, who said that he heard ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr said: “I swear by Allah that he was as Ibn Raqīqah said, ‘shall I not cry over him, shall I not cry over him, both wealths are with him.”

Al-Khallāl has also narrated (p. 438) from al-A‘mash, from Mujāhid who said:

Had you seen Mu‘āwiyah you would have said, “this is the Maḥdī”.

Aḥmad narrated in his *Musnad* (4/93) from Wakī - who said - Abū al-Mu‘tamir narrated to us, from Ibn Sīrīn, from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه who said that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “Do not ride on [saddles made of] silk and leopards skins.” And Mu‘āwiyah was one who is not accused of anything in terms of what he narrates from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Al-Ājurri narrates in *al-Sharī‘ah* (5/2466 – number 1955) that a man from Marw [Merv] asked ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak whether Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was superior or ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, so ibn al-Mubārak responded:

The dust that entered the nostrils of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه with the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم is better than ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī narrated in his *Tarīkh* (1/209) by way of Rabāh ibn al-Jarrāh al-Mawṣilī – who said – I heard a man asking al-Mu‘āfā ibn ‘Imrān how does ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz compare with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and he became extremely angry and said:

None can be compared to the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم; Mu‘āwiyah is his companion, his brother-in-law, his scribe and one entrusted with the *Waḥī* [Revelation] from Allah.

I say, it has been previously mentioned regarding ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ appointing him over al-Shām after the demise of his brother Yazīd; and likewise ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. this is sufficient proof that he had virtue in their opinion. What can be included in the praise of the companions for Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was that some of them and some of the great successors narrated from him ḥadīth as will follow in a later section.

Praise for him by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his Senior Companions

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta’zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (2/134):

‘Alī عليه السلام took responsibility for fighting the people who rebelled, and he narrated from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم regarding them all that he narrates, and he called them believers, and ruled them with the laws of the believers, and likewise ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir.

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta’zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (361) by way of Qays ibn Muslim, from Ṭāriq ibn Shihāb who said:

I was with ‘Alī عليه السلام when the fighting ended at Nahrawān and it was said to him, “Are they polytheists?”, to which he replied, “It was polytheism from which they fled.” Then it was said, “Hypocrites?” and he responded, “Hypocrites do not remember Allah, except a little.” Then it was asked what they were and he replied, “a group of people who rebelled against us and we fought them.”

He has a similar narration by way of Ishāq, from Wakī, from Mis‘ar, from ‘Āmir ibn Shaqīq, from Abū Wā’il – who said:

A man said: “Who called to the grey mule on the day the polytheists were fought,” so ‘Alī said, “It was polytheism from which they fled.” Then it was said, “hypocrites?” and he responded, “Hypocrites do not remember Allah, except a little.” Then it was asked what they were and he replied, “a group of people who rebelled against us and we fought them and were victorious against them.”

He also narrates in *Ta’zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* by way of Ishāq, from Abū Nu‘aym, from Sufyān, from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, from his father who said:

‘Alī heard of the Day of Jamal or the Day of Ṣiffīn a person exceeding the bounds in what he was saying [against the opposing party] so he said: “Do

not say anything except that which is good. All that they are is a people who claim that we have rebelled against them, and we say that they have rebelled against them; and on that we have fought them.”

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī further narrates in *Taʿzīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* by way of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā – who said – Aḥmad ibn Khālīd narrated to us – who said – Muḥammad ibn Rāshid narrated to us from Makḥūl that the companions of ‘Alī عليه السلام asked regarding the companions of Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام what is their situation? He said: “They are believers.”

He narrates further in *Taʿzīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* by way of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā – who said – Aḥmad ibn Khālīd narrated to us – who said – ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Salamah narrated to us from ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn [Abī] ‘Awn who said:

‘Alī passed by the martyrs at Ṣiffīn while leaning on al-Ashtar and he found Ḥābis al-Yemānī slain to which al-Ashtar claimed, “To Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return, Ḥābis al-Yemānī is with them, O Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn, he has the sign of Mu‘āwiyah. By Allah, I always assumed him to be a believer,” to which ‘Alī replied, “and now he is still a believer. Ḥābis was from the people of Yemen, people of piety and exertion in worship.”¹

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr narrated from Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā – who said – Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd narrated to us – who said – al-Mukhtār ibn Nāfi‘ narrated to us from Abū Maṭar who said:

‘Alī said: “When is the most wretched of them going to rise up violently?” it was said to him, “Who is the most wretched?” and he replied, “the one who will kill me.” So ibn Muljim struck him with his sword and it landed on the head of ‘Alī and the Muslims wanted to kill him. However, Alī prevented them saying, “do not kill the man, for if I recover then it will be retribution

1 The editor of the book says: ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, he is ibn al-Mājīshūn – the additional information on his name is from *al-Tahdhīb*, and the second additional clarification in his teachers name is from *al-Minhāj* and *al-Tahdhīb*

for the wounds and if I die, then kill him”, and he said, “you are dead.” ‘Alī replied, “what makes you so certain?” to which he answered, “my sword was poisoned.”

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr narrates with his chain from ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir that man said that the people of al-Shām had committed disbelief and ‘Ammār responded:

Do not say that; our Qiblah is one, our Prophet is one. However, they are a people who have been affected by fitnah and it is our duty to fight them to bring them upon the right.

He also narrates with an alternative chain to ‘Ammar ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه that he said:

Our Qiblah is one, our Prophet is one, our call is one; however they are a group who has rebelled against us and we have fought them on account of it.

He narrated with an alternative chain from Rayāḥ ibn al-Ḥārith, from ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه that he said:

Do not say that the people of al-Shām have disbelieved; rather say that they have strayed or transgressed.

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr narrates from Hārūn ibn ‘Abd Allāh, from Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd, from Mis‘ar, from Thābit ibn Abī Hudhayl that he asked Abū Ja‘far regarding the people of Jamal and he replied: “Believers,” or “Not disbelievers.”

He narrates, with two alternative chains from Abū Ja‘far, the statements mentioned in the narration above.

The Pledge of Allegiance to Mu'āwiyah by Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, the Members of Their Household, and the Rest of the Ṣaḥābah

This section has a number of topics as the reader will come to see.

Firstly, Ḥasan رضي الله عنه gave the pledge of allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه willingly and not under duress. The evidence for that is the fact that Ḥasan had the entire army of Iraq with him; and they had pledged their allegiance to him after the demise of his father, and they were ready to assist him in whatever way necessary. It was only the riffraff and the ruffians in the society that betrayed him; and this is a natural occurrence that people defect to the opposing camp. However, this indicates that Ḥasan رضي الله عنه chose to pledge allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه out of his own free will; and that he was not coerced into doing so; and it was done out of displeasure at the spilling of innocent blood and the division within the ranks of the Muslims. Otherwise, he could have continued the fighting if he so wished, or at least go into hiding to avoid pledging allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He remained on this pledge until his demise.

What further supports this is the fact that those who were on the side of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, like his brother Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and the rest of his family, all pledged allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Will it be said that they were all coerced into doing so? Yes, some among them disliked that Ḥasan abdicated. However, when they had seen his firm decision on this matter they followed him and pledged their allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, and this year was named the year of *Jamā'ah* [collectiveness or unity], since all were united under the leadership of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Furthermore, it adding support to this explanation is the fact that Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه remained on this pledge until the demise of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, whose reign lasted twenty years. His revolt only occurred in the reign of Yazīd since he refused to pledge allegiance to Yazīd; and that was at the end of the reign of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, when he ordered the people to give the pledge of allegiance to Yazīd after him. Many of the Ṣaḥābah, among them Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه, refrained from giving the

pledge. He remained firm on this until he revolted with a small party, mostly from his noble household, after his Shī'ah in Kūfah betrayed him by misleading him in their promise of assistance and loyalty until the unfortunate ending of Ḥusayn عليه السلام, who was brutally murdered. So, notice how different this is from the pledge of Ḥasan to Mu'āwiyah. During his time he had an entire army under his command and they were prepared to fight if he so instructed, and to defend him. It is for this reason that Ḥasan عليه السلام did not say to anyone, not from his family, nor anyone else, that his pledge was coerced; and this is evident and clear for anyone who reads the history of these events.

Secondly, in all that preceded is a clear rebuttal of those who criticise Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام to the extent of declaring him a disbeliever. Is it conceivable that Ḥasan and Ḥusayn عليهما السلام, and all those who were with them, that they would pledge allegiance to a disbeliever? It is not conceivable ever!

Thirdly, when Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام came into office and the entire ummah pledged allegiance to him he did not bring about much change as far as the religious matters are concerned. So the hallmark features of the religion continued to be displayed, and the religious affairs flourished. The call to prayer was still called out, and the prayers continued to be observed, the zakāh was still collected, people continued to fast and the ḥajj rites were observed. If Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام could not perform ḥajj he would send someone in his place. As a matter of fact, the jihād was still active especially against the Romans. A few Ṣaḥābah joined his campaign to conquer Constantinople; to the extent that Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī was buried in Constantinople on his request during the campaign against the Romans and that is the clearest refutation against those who cast allegations against Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام. Since, if the matter was as these people claim it to be, he would have prohibited the call for prayer to be announced loudly, and the observance of prayer and fasting would have been restricted, and the zakāh would have been replaced by taxes and levies and the rites of ḥajj would have been abandoned and no armies would have been sent to continue the jihād.

Fourthly, during his reign and during the period in which he and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه fought, he never sought assistance from the Romans; nor did he seek to join forces with them against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. What prevented him from doing that was his Islam and faith; how could he seek the aid of a disbeliever against a Muslim. Otherwise, there was nothing standing in his way from doing that to fulfil his wishes and fancies if that were all he was after.

Fifthly, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was from the learned among the Ṣaḥābah and the Authority of this ummah and the Interpreter the Qur’ān, ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه, described him as a jurist and a person with deep insight into religious matters, as has been earlier mentioned.

Al-Khallāl has related in *al-Sunnah* (pg 438) from Muḥammad ibn Ḥiṣn – who said – Muḥamad ibn Zunbūr who said:

Al-Fuḍayl said: “The most reliable of all my actions is my love for Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ; and my love for all the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صلی الله علیه وسلم,” and he used to pray for the mercy of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and say, “he was from the learned among the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم.”

I say: Fuḍayl is Ibn ‘Ayyād, and he was from the most revered of people during his era. He was well-known for austerity and worship and he is from the generation after the successors.

What also indicates his [Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه] knowledge and understanding is all that has been narrated of him with regards to legal verdicts and juristic issues which was known of him and which have been spread out in the books of the scholars. Some of these will be mentioned later – with Allah’s permission – and Ibn Ḥazm has mentioned him from the middle category of those who issued legal verdicts from the Ṣaḥābah.

In addition to all of that he was a narrator and the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم would narrate from him.

Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī, in his book *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah* (5/2497), has mentioned those companions and successors who narrate from him. He said:

Those who narrate from him from the companions are: ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Abū al-Dardā’, Jarīr, al-Nu‘mān, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, Wā’il ibn Ḥujr and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr’; and from the successors: Sa‘īd ibn al-Mūsāyyib, ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ, ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, Ṭsā ibn Ṭalḥah, Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh, Qāsim ibn Muḥammad among others.

Ibn Ḥazm has mentioned of him 163 narrations from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in his famous treatise, *Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah al-Ruwāt* (pg.277).

Ibn al-Wazīr al-Yemānī, in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, has mentioned the narrations of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and he was extensive on his expert opinion thereof. He mentioned the summary of it in his book *al-Rowḍ al-Bāsim*, whose comments shall be mentioned later – with Allah’s permission.

These are some of the proofs that indicate his knowledge; that which has been passed on from his legal verdicts and fulfilment of the duty of inviting to Allah and forbidding the evil. From these are:

1. What has been narrated by al-Bukhārī (587) by way of Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far – who said – Shu‘bah has narrated to us from Abū Tayyāḥ – who said – I heard Ḥumrān ibn Abān narrating from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he said:

Indeed you perform a prayer; and we have been in the company of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ yet we have not seen him praying it. He used to prohibit it – meaning two Rak‘ahs after ‘Aṣr.

1 The narrations of Abū Sa‘īd and Jarīr are both in *Muslim*, the narration of Ibn ‘Abbās in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and from the younger companions is al-Sā‘ib ibn Yazīd and his narration appears in *Muslim*.

2. Al-Bukhārī (5932) narrates from Ismā'īl, from Mālik, from Ibn Shihāb, from Ḥumayd ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf that he heard Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه during the year that he performed Ḥajj – whilst on the Mimbar – and he took a bunch of [false] hair from a guard and said:

Where are your scholars? I have heard the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیہ وسلم prohibiting the likes of this and saying: “The destruction only came on Banū Isrā'īl when their women adopted this.”

3. Aḥmad narrates (4/96) by way of Ibn Jurayj – who said - ‘Amr ibn ‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī al-Khuwār narrated to him that Nāfi‘ ibn Jubayr sent him to al-Sā'ib ibn Yazīd asking him about something that he had seen from Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه in prayer. So he replied:

Yes, I have prayed with him the Friday Prayer in the enclosure. After concluding the prayer I stood up in my place and performed [Sunnah] prayer. When he entered he called for me and said, “do not do that again. If you completed your Friday prayer do not perform [additional] prayer until you have spoken or moved from your spot since the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیہ وسلم had commanded to do this. Do not link the prayers [by performing Sunnah prayers immediately after the obligatory Friday prayers] until you leave [your spot] or you speak.”

– it has also been narrated by Muslim through ibn Jurayj – who said - ‘Amr ibn ‘Aṭā’ narrated to us... [with the same chain].

4. Aḥmad narrates (4/100) from Marwān ibn Mu'āwiyah al-Fazārī – who said - Ḥabīb ibn al-Shahīd narrated to us from Abū Mijlaz who said that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه exited on one occasion and everyone stood up for him, to which he remarked:

I heard the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیہ وسلم saying: “Whoever is pleased by the men standing up for him should prepare his abode in the Fire.”

It has also been reported by al-Tirmidhī (2755) by way of Qabīṣah, from Sufyān, from Ḥabīb with the above chain; and al-Tirmidhī graded it Ḥasan. Aḥmad also narrates it (4/94) by way of Ismāʿīl, from Ḥabīb ibn al-Shahīd, from Abū Mijlaz that Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه entered the home in which Ibn ʿĀmir and Ibn al-Zubayr were both present. When he entered Ibn ʿĀmir stood up and Ibn al-Zubayr remained seated so Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه said:

Sit, for I have heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying: “Whoever pleases him that the slaves [of Allah] should stand up for him; let him prepare his abode in the Fire.”

He also narrates it at another place in his *Musnad* (4/91) by way of Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar, from Shuʿbah, with this narration, a similar meaning.

5. Abū Dāwūd narrates in his *Sunan* (2074) from Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Fāris – who said – Yaʿqūb ibn Ibrāhīm narrated to us – who said – my father narrated to us from Ibn Ishāq – who said – ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Hurmuz al-Aʿraj narrated to him that ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās married his daughter to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥakam, who in turn married his daughter to ‘Abbās and that was made the dowry. So Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه wrote to Marwān instructing him to separate them and wrote in his instruction, “this is the *Shighār* [marrying of one’s female relative on condition that the other party does the same and that would be the dowry] that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم prohibited.” Aḥmad narrates it (4/94) by way of Ibrāhīm ibn Saʿd with this chain.
6. Aḥmad narrates in his *Musnad* (4/93) from Hāshim ibn al-Qāsim – who said – Ḥarīz narrated to us from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿAwf al-Jurashī, from Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه that he said:

I had seen the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم kissing his tongue or lips – referring to Ḥasan – and that tongue or lips which have been kissed by the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم shall never be punished.

7. Aḥmad narrates in his *Musnad* (4/94) from ‘Alī ibn Baḥr – who said – al-Walīd ibn Muslim narrated to us – who said – ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Alā‘ narrated to us from Abū al-Azhar, from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he mentioned to them the ablution of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم that he wiped his head with a handful of water, such that the water dripped – or nearly dripped – off his head. Then he physically showed them the ablution of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and when he came to the wiping of the head he placed his hands at the front of his head and moved them backward to the base of the neck and then brought his hands forward again to their former position, which he began from.

The Narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt from Mu‘āwiyah

Their narrating from him indicates his virtue and his trustworthiness in their eyes. The narrations of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه has been previously mentioned; and from other narrations which he narrates is the narration of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad in the *Zawā'id* of his *Musnad* (4/97) from ‘Amr ibn Muḥammad al-Nāqid, from Abū Aḥmad al-Zubayrī, from Sufyān, from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, from his father, from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه, from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه who said:

I clipped from the hair of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم at Marwah.

The essence of this narration is to be found in *al-Bukhārī* (1730) by way of Tāwūs, from Ibn ‘Abbās, from Mu‘āwiyah.

From those who narrate from is as well is Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib – known as Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah – and from his narrations is what Aḥmad narrates in his *Musnad* (4/97) from ‘Affān, from Ḥammād ibn Salamah, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Aqīl, from Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī – Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah – from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه who said:

Permanent residency is permitted from those who own it.

Sixthly, his jīḥād; since he fought alongside the Prophet ﷺ, and was present for some of the major encounters. Ibn Saʿd says in his *Ṭabaqāt* (7/406):

...and he was witnessed with the Prophet ﷺ [the expeditions of] Ḥunayn and al-Ṭāʾif.

And from his military activities during his governorship of al-Shām during the eras of both ʿUmar رضي الله عنه and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, and after his rise to leadership, are as follows:

1. He sought permission from ʿUthman to take a naval expedition to Cyprus and Allah allowed Cyprus to be conquered at his hands.

And it is this expedition that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said of it:

The first army to fight on the sea will be incumbent [for Paradise].

Al-Bukhārī narrates (2924) by way of ʿUmayr ibn al-Aswad that he came to ʿUbadah ibn al-Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه when he was descending upon Ḥimṣ in a structure of his and with him was Umm Ḥarām - ʿUmayr says – she narrated to us that she heard the Prophet ﷺ, saying:

The first army to fight in the sea; [Paradise] will be incumbent for them. So she asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ if she would be one of them and he said, “you are among them.”

Al-Bukhārī (2799-2800) narrates it by way of al-Layth, through Anas ibn Mālīk, from his aunt Umm Ḥarām bint Maḥḥān and he mentioned the narration; and at the end he says:

The first naval expedition by the Muslims was by Muʿāwiyah.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (6/90):

... and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the first to undertake a naval expedition and that was during the era of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the leader of that navy.¹

2. The first siege of Constantinople was during his era in the year 49 A.H. In the army dispatched by Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه were: Ibn 'Abbās, Ibn al-Zubayr and Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī.²
3. In the year 54 A.H Constantinople was laid siege to for the second time under the command of 'Abd Allāh ibn Qays al-Ḥārithī and reinforced by Faḍālah ibn 'Ubayd. The siege continued for six to seven years.³
4. As for the conquest of North Africa, they began in the year 41 A.H. Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه instructed his governor over Egypt, 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ to prepare an army against the Byzantine colonisers and he prepared an army under the leadership of 'Uqbah ibn Nāfi' al-Fihri who conquered many of the North African territories.
5. During his reign the city of Qayrawān was established, which was the central point for further conquests in North Africa.
6. During his era many parts of Central Asia, like Khorāsān, Sijistān and Kābul were conquered. These campaigns began between 42-43 A.H when he appointed 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Āmir ibn Kurayz and he was the representative of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه; when he appointed 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Samurah ibn Ḥabīb over those regions and made him responsible for the military campaigns there. The city of Marw was the base of operations there and the governor of Marw was al-Ḥakam ibn 'Amr al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه.

Seventhly, he was very particular with upholding the sharī'ah and forbade any opposition to the Qur'ān and Sunnah. This is clearly highlighted by the many

1 See *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr* (2/601), Ibn 'Asākir , and Ibn Kathīr (10/228)

2 See *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr* (3/206)

3 Ibid

incidents in his life where he displayed this demeanour and some of that has already been touched on in the earlier paragraphs where his knowledge and narrations were mentioned.

Eighthly, his honesty and precision and accuracy in what he narrates. Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه is known for his trustworthiness and he is not accused in what he narrates. Al-Khallāl has narrated in *al-Sunnah* (pg. 447) that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was asked about a person who ridicules Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ رضي الله عنه will such a person be called a Rāfiḍī? He responded:

None shall have the courage to say something about them except that he harbours within himself evil intent.

Al-Mizzī has mentioned in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (1/45):

Al-Ḥākim has narrated with his chain to Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Qābisī who said, "I heard Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Hilāl saying, 'Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasā'ī was asked about Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, the Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم and he said: 'Indeed Islam is like a home with a door. The door of Islam is the Ṣaḥābah. So whoever causes harm to the Ṣaḥābah in essence wishes to cause harm to Islam just as one who knocks at the door intends to enter that home. As for those who seek out Mu'āwiyah, they only want to get to the Ṣaḥābah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned in his collection of *Fatāwā* (35/66):

It is known that there were issues in which Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ رضي الله عنه were at odds with others. However, no one ever accused them of lying against the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, neither from their supporters nor from their opposition. Actually, all the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi'īn are unanimous in the view that they were trustworthy in what they report from the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, and the hypocrite is not trusted in what he relates from the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم. The hypocrite is a liar against him and one who belies him.

He was cautious and meticulous in what he narrated from the Prophet ﷺ, and these are some examples. Aḥmad narrates in his *Musnad* (4/99) from Ibn Maḥdī, from Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ṣāliḥ, from Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd, from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir al-Yaḥṣubī who heard Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه saying:

Beware of what you report of the ḥadīth of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; except that which was narrated during the time of ‘Umar since he made people fear Allah. I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying, “whoever Allah wishes good for, He grants him deep understanding in the religion.”

It has also been narrated by Muslim (1037).

Al-Bukhārī (*al-Fatḥ* 13/333) reports that Abū al-Yemānī narrated from Shu‘ayb, from al-Zuhrī, from Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān that he heard Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه addressed a group from the Quraysh in Madīnah and he mentioned Ka‘b al-Aḥbār, and said:

He is from the most truthful of those who narrated from the people of the Book, yet with that we still take caution in his narrations from error.

‘Uthmān al-Dārimī, in his refutation of al-Marīsī (364) said:

The opposition claims to have heard from the Abū al-Ṣalt mentioning that Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه also had a place known as the House of Wisdom and whoever had any ḥadīth [written] it would be kept there and would be narrated afterwards. However, this incident we do not know of it nor do we find any reference to it in the narrations. So, we do not know from whom Abū al-Ṣalt is narrating from, for indeed he has not reported it from a reliable source since Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه was known for limited narrations and if he wished he could have narrated in excess; however he avoided that. He would caution people from abundant narration from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to the extent that he would say, “beware of what you narrate from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; except that which was narrated during the time of ‘Umar since ‘Umar used to instill within

the people the fear of Allah.” Ibn Šāliḥ narrated to us, from Mu‘āwiyah ibn Šāliḥ and he mentioned his chain. The claim of the opposition is a great accusation against Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he would carelessly collect the narrations of people without checking and attributing it to the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. If Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه permitted this approach he would have used it for his own agenda and attributed it to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, yet he would only accept of it if he was certain of it being from the Šaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and he would not just accept what people said [regarding prophetic narrations]. What the limited narrations from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم by Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه – even though he was the scribe – indicates is the untruthfulness of what you narrated from Abū al-Šalt; and if you are honest you will mention the chain; for undoubtedly you will not relate it from a competent narrator.

Ibn al-Wazīr al-Šan‘ānī has mentioned that narrations of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and explained that he did not narrate these narrations individually. He said in *al-‘Awāšim min al-Qawāšim* (3/163):

After these principles I will mention to you what supports it from the narrations of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه from the six books so that you realise three things:

1. the fact that he is supported in narrations.
2. that his narrations are limited.
3. that his narrations are not munkar.

Then he mentioned the narrations and explained who jointly narrated them from the Šaḥābah. He says further (3/207):

And this is the extent of Mu‘āwiyah’s narrations in the six books and *Musnad Aḥmad* according to my knowledge. The total of the narrations is sixty narrations which include the sound and the weak narrations... he narrates very little considering his long life and plentiful interaction, and the sound narrations do not correspond with anything that raises concern or is a means of questioning his narrations...

He also said in *al-Rowḍ al-Bāsim* (2/523-543) :

The third group: Mu'āwiyah, Mughīrah, 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ, and those who have previously mentioned in the erroneous presumptions. Indeed many of the Shī'ah have mentioned that there are many factors surrounding these three which indicate ta'wīl, and they object to the authentication of their narrations in the authentic ḥadīth books like *al-Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. As for the partisans of ḥadīth, their way is that they are from the people of ta'wīl and ijtihād on the basis of them expressing the interpretation in a way that could be conceived. As for knowledge of what is within, then that is concealed from all; and between these two parties, in this matter, is what cannot be addressed in this concise work. The objective is simply to reiterate the authenticity of the authentic narrations and to defend it, nothing besides it – like explaining the differences between both parties. I have given my best effort in this book to support the authentic narrations by ways that are agreed upon by both parties in terms of its authenticity or in terms of the general principles that necessitate authenticity as will be noticed by one who carefully observes the book. At this point I do not find a path that is close and unanimous except one path; and that is to show the truthfulness of these mentioned, in their narrations. This is by the testimony of those whom the Shi'ah have not accused from the Ṣaḥābah, about the authenticity of every narration by singling them out; particularly the narrations used for religious rulings which establish the lawful and prohibit the unlawful. As for Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī and 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ and the likes of them whom it was not correctly proven of them that they fought 'Alī, nor cursed, then the response to the objections of the opposition have already been mentioned earlier. As for these three, it is them whom I wish to prove that their narrations are sound. I will restrict myself to the narrations dealing with *Aḥkām* [legal topics] for the sake of brevity. This will be completed by mentioning their narrations pertaining to legal *Aḥkām*, as well as the complimentary narrations and corroboratory reports from the other Ṣaḥābah from the Prophet ﷺ and I will attempt to limit myself to being as concise as possible without diminishing from the academic nature of this discussion – with Allah's permission – so I begin:

1. The narration prohibiting false hair and wigs for women. Al-Bukhārī, Muslim and others report it and it has been supported by the complimentary narration of Asmā', 'Ā'ishah and Jābir. As for the narration of Asmā' it has been reported by Muslim and al-Nasā'ī; the narration of 'Ā'ishah has been reported by al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasā'ī; and the narration of Jābir by Muslim.
2. "A party from by ummah will remain dominant; upon the truth..." Al-Bukhārī and Muslim both report it from him. Muslim has reported it from Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ. Muslim, Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī all report it from Thowbān. Al-Tirmidhī reports it from Mu'āwiyah ibn Qurrah. Abū Dāwūd reports it from 'Imrān ibn Huṣayn.
3. The narration prohibiting the two rak'ahs after 'Aṣr prayer has been reported by al-Bukhārī. It has also been reported from Umm Salamah by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī. Muslim reported from 'Umar that he used to discipline those who prayed after 'Aṣr and no one reprimanded him for that, which is treated by some as an *Ijmā'* [scholarly consensus]. This is also the position of many of the jurists.
4. The narration on the prohibition on demanding when asking [seeking financial assistance] has been recorded by Muslim. It has also been reported from Ibn 'Umar by al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasā'ī. Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī report it from Samurah ibn Jundub. al-Bukhārī reports it from Zubayr ibn al-'Awwām; and al-Nasā'ī from 'Ā'id ibn 'Amr. Al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā'ī and Mālik in his *Muwatta* report it from Abū Hurayrah. Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī both record it from Thowbān; and Mālik from 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr. al-Bukhārī, Muslim, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī all relate it from Ḥakīm ibn Ḥizām; and Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī from Ibn al-Fārisī, from his father.
5. The narration, "this affair will remain with the Quraysh," has been reported from him by al-Bukhārī. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim both report it from Ibn 'Umar and Abū Hurayrah; and Muslim from Jābir.

6. The narration for lashing the person who drinks alcohol; and killing him on the fourth occasion has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī. As for the lashing, it is known by necessity and its narrations are plenty. However, the additional punishment of killing a fourth time offender has also been reported from Abū Hurayrah by al-Tirmidhī and Abū Dāwūd; who also reports it from Qabīṣah and other companions. Al-Imām al-Hādī, Yahyā ibn Ḥusayn, reports it in *Kitāb al-Aḥkām*; however this ruling has been abrogated according to most scholars.
7. The narration prohibiting the wearing of silk, gold and the hides of predators has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd. Al-Nasā'ī and al-Tirmidhī report a portion of it with variant wording. The supplementary narrations for the prohibition of silk and gold are more famous than to be mentioned. As for the prohibition on the hides of predators, it has been reported by an alternative chain from Abū al-Malīḥ by Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī.
8. The narration of the ummah being divided into seventy-odd groups has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd. al-Tirmidhī reports it from Ibn 'Amr; as does he and Abū Dāwūd from Abū Hurayrah.
9. The narration for the prohibition of preceding the Imām in rukū' and sajdah has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Mājah. It has been reported from Abū Hurayrah by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī. Mālik also reports it in *al-Muwattaʿa*. Muslim and al-Nasā'ī report it from Anas.
10. The narration prohibiting Shighār has been narrated from him by Abū Dāwūd. al-Bukhārī and Muslim narrate it from ibn 'Umar and it is reached the status of popular narrations and the resultant practise on this narration resembles Ijma'.
11. The narration of him performing ablution like the Prophet ﷺ has been recorded by Abū Dāwūd, and it does not require any corroboration except for the fact of pouring water over the head and face, which Abū Dāwūd also narrates from 'Alī.

12. The narration prohibiting wailing has been reported from him by Ibn Mājah and is more famous than to mention other narrations.
13. The prohibition on being pleased by others standing has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī. It has a supporting narration from Anas by al-Tirmidhī; and by Abū Umāmah in Abū Dāwūd. In al-Nawawī's book on the concession for standing he related the previous two narrations and from Abū Bakrah. Al-Nawawī ratified the narration of Anas.
14. The narration prohibiting excessive praise has been reported from him by Ibn Mājah. Al-Bukhārī, Muslim and Abū Dāwūd report it from Abū Bakrah; and al-Bukhārī and Muslim from Abū Mūsā. Muslim, Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī reported it from Miqdād ibn al-Aswad; and al-Tirmidhī from Abū Hurayrah.
15. Prohibiting all intoxicants; Ibn Mājah reports it from him while the rest besides Ibn Mājah report it from Ibn 'Umar. Muslim and al-Nasā'ī report it from Jābir; Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī from Ibn 'Abbās as well.
16. The ruling of one who forgets something during prayer; this narration has been reported from him by al-Nasā'ī and it has a complimentary narration from Thowbān in Abū Dāwūd.
17. The prohibition of *Qirān* [combining ḥajj and 'umrah in one journey with the same intention] has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd; and it has also been reported from Ibn 'Umar, as Mālik recorded. The narrations from 'Umar and 'Uthmān [not tracing back to the Prophet ﷺ] have both been reported by Muslim.
18. The narration that the Prophet ﷺ had his hair trimmed by a clipper after his 'umrah and after his ḥajj has been reported from him by al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā'ī. A similar narration has been related from 'Alī and 'Uthmān, both in Muslim. Mālik has narrated in his *Muwatta* from Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, as well as al-Nasā'ī and al-Tirmidhī, who authenticated it. Al-Nasā'ī also narrated it from Ibn 'Abbās, from

‘Umar; and al-Tirmidhī from ‘Umar. al-Bukhārī and Muslim both report it from ‘Imrān ibn al-Ḥuṣayn; and al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā’ī both report the version of it where Mu‘āwiyah narrates it and Ibn ‘Abbās comments that it goes against his own view since Mu‘āwiyah did not consider Tamattu’ valid [combining ḥajj and ‘umrah in one journey with separate intentions].

19. The narration which he narrates from his sister, Umm Ḥabībah, the wife of the Prophet ﷺ that he, the Prophet ﷺ, would pray in the same garment that he had relations with her in, as long as the garment was not soiled. Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā’ī both report this from him. There are many narrations that support a similar meaning; among them that the Prophet ﷺ would pray in his sandals as long as they were not soiled as narrated by al-Bukhārī and Muslim from Sa’d ibn Yazīd; and Abū Dāwūd from Abū Sa’d al-Khudrī. This narration is supported by many other narrations like the one that says a person need not repeat his ablution unless he is certain of passing wind by the evidence of sound or smell, there are plenty of narrations that support the maxim that unless there is evidence to the contrary, the ruling is assumed as it was previously and prominent examples for these would be the eating on the day of doubt, which is the last day of Sha’bān, if the moon is not seen due to cloudy weather etc.; likewise the fasting of the final day of Ramaḍān if the moon is not sighted.
20. The narration of the prohibition of eating garlic or onions before entering the Prophet’s ﷺ Masjid. This is a narration that he narrates via his father and has many supporting narrations. Mālik reports it from Jābir as do al-Bukhārī and Muslim; the two of them also report it from Anas. Muslim and Mālik both report it from Abū Hurayrah; whereas Abū Dāwūd report it from Ḥudhayfah and al-Mughīrah. al-Bukhārī, Muslim and Abū Dāwūd report it from Ibn ‘Umar; whilst al-Nasā’ī narrates it from ‘Umar. Muslim and Abū Dāwūd narrate it from Abū Sa’d al-Khudrī. As for the prohibition of eating from those two trees in general, it is not restricted to entering the Prophet’s ﷺ Masjid, it has been reported by al-Bukhārī and Muslim from Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh; and Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

21. The narration regarding ‘Āshūrā’ not being prescribed has been reported from him by Mālik, al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasā’ī. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim have both reported from Ibn ‘Abbās a narration that supports this meaning and it is the meaning understood from the response of the Prophet ﷺ after asking about the reason of fasting that day from the Jews where he says, “I am more deserving of Mūsā,” and his statement, “we fast it out of veneration for him.”

22. The narration about hijrah not coming to an end has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd; although it is not correct from him. Al-Khaṭṭābī said that there is some objection in the chain. There is, however, a similar narration from ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Sa’dī recorded by al-Nasā’ī.

23. The narration of wearing gold in clothing, Abū Dāwūd reports it from him. It is supported by a narration from a group of companions reported by al-Nasā’ī.

24. The prohibition of misleading questions, al-Khaṭṭābī said it is not correct from him since there appears in the chain a narrator who is unknown. Abū al-Sa’ādāt ibn al-Athīr has corroborated it with another narration from Abū Hurayrah in *Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl*.

25. The narration with separating between the obligatory Friday prayer and the nafl by speech or exiting has been reported from him by Muslim. There is a similar narration in both al-Bukhārī and Muslim from Ibn ‘Umar from the practice of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Abū Dāwūd has reported a similar narration from Abū Mas’ūd al-Zuraqī with regards to the Imām doing this.

26. The narration that every sin may be forgiven by Allah besides Shirk and murdering a believer; this has been reported from him by al-Nasā’ī. It is supported by a narration from Abū al-Dardā’ in Abū Dāwūd; as well as by the verse in the Qur’ān.

27. The narration regarding being rewarded when interceding on behalf of someone has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd. It is a well-known

narration to be found in al-Bukhārī and Muslim from Abū Mūsā, and the Qur'ān supports this meaning as well.

28. Prohibition for collecting the faults of people; this has been reported from him by Abū Dāwūd. It has complimentary narrations in al-Tirmidhī from Ibn 'Umar; in Muslim from Abū Hurayrah and in Abū Dāwūd itself from Abū Barzah al-Aslamī, 'Uqbah ibn 'Āmir and Zayd ibn Wahb
29. The narration, "whoever Allah wishes good for; He grants him deep understanding in the religion," al-Bukhārī reports this from him; and it has two narrations to support it. One narration is from Ibn 'Abbās and the other from Abū Hurayrah; al-Tirmidhī mentioned them both and authenticated the narration of Ibn 'Abbās.

So these are all the narrations of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه which are expressly clear in the category of Aḥkām; or legal rulings may be extracted from them. They are all in conformity with the *Madh-hab* [school of thought] of the Shī'ah and the jurists; and there is nothing in these narrations that the vast majority of scholars have not adopted except for the narration of killing the fourth-time offender for drinking alcohol on account of abrogation. However, the leading scholar of the Zaydīs has narrated it as we have mentioned earlier. His narrations have been consistent with what has been narration from the other reliable Ṣaḥābah in all that they narrate. Therefore, I am really surprised by those who condemn the compilers of the *Ṣiḥāḥ* [sound collections] for reporting these narrations and including them in the sound collections.

He has, besides these narrations, a few others which are famous which we have omitted mentioning them and their complimentary corroboratory narrations for the sake of brevity. We can make subtle reference to them here so that they may be identified; among them is his narration on the virtues of the mu'adhin, the virtue of answering the call of the adhān, the virtues of the gatherings of knowledge, and that Laylat al-Qadr is on the 27th night, the virtue of loving the Anṣār, the virtue of Ṭalḥah, the date of

the demise of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and that he departed from this world at the age of sixty-three. Also the ḥadīth with the supplication, “O Allah there is none to withhold what You give...” Muslim reports this from ‘Alī, from him. Also the narration of “Goodness is a habit...” and “... all that remains in this world is trial and tribulation,” and “Indeed actions are like a vessel, if the lower part is pure the upper part is pure as well,” as well as the individuals regarding whom the verse of hoarding gold and silver¹ was revealed. Add to that two statements of his which are *Mowqūf* [statement of a companion which does not trace back to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ].

So this is the bulk of his narrations in the six major collections and none has escaped me except a few which I may have inadvertently missed out, and that is something which no human can be free from. There is nothing in his narrations which contradict the established narrations; although there are some narrations whose chain up to him is not sound or the authenticity of these are disputed. The bulk of which the soundness is agreed upon is from the category of Aḥkām and of virtues which number thirteen narrations, al-Bukhārī and Muslim have agreed on four, and al-Bukhārī independently narrates four, and Muslim five. This is a proof of the honesty of that period and their abstinence from descending to the level of the liars – may Allah forsake them – and if nothing indicates their honesty then suffice to that is the fact that Mu‘āwiyah ؓ has not narrated anything in criticism of ‘Alī ever, neither did he narrate anything that legitimises fighting with him; nor did he narrate anything of the merits of ‘Uthmān ؓ or in criticism of those who participated in his assassination; even though his army would have believed him and it would have been in his better interests to stir them up with such emotions. However, he did not do any of that throughout this lengthy period; neither during the lifetime of ‘Alī ؓ nor after his demise. Add to that the fact that he did not narrate any narration that is in opposition to the teachings of Islam or

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 34

which seeks to destroy its foundations. It is for this reason that more than one of the notable Ṣaḥābah and Tābi'īn narrated from him like Ibn 'Abbās, Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, Ibn al-Zubayr, Ibn al-Mūsāyyib, Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Sammān, Abū Idrīs al-Khowlānī, Abū Salamah ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān, 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, Sālim ibn 'Abd Allāh, Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn and so many others besides them. As for those who narrated from these people, they were of a similar calibre. I only mention this so that you realise that the scholars of ḥadīth were not the only ones who chose to narrate his narrations since it is known that they will not accept a narration except whose chain is continuous with reliable narrators. Were it not for the reliable narrators of every generation narrating his ḥadīth, they would not have accepted it as his narrations; and if it did not meet their criteria of acceptance that it is his ḥadīth, they would not have included them in their sound collections. I have only mentioned this here on the basis of being familiar with it, although the major proof is in what had preceded. And Allah knows best.

The Shī'ah Mu'tazilah have accepted that which is of greater consequence than accepting his narrations, according to their principles; the *Mursal* [narration with interrupted chain] of the reliable narrators which is accepted by them without restrictions. So, they accepted the narrations of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه without realising it. As a matter of fact, they accepted many a fabrication which have sometimes been transmitted by some of the reliable narrators who, with a clear conscience, narrated from individuals who were unknowns and in some cases from the criticised narrators.

And this is what happens to those who accept Mursal reports that such narrations enter upon him without realising... so the acceptance of Mursal reports on this basis is a cause for greater harm and allows easier access for lies against the Messenger of Allah ﷺ so it is necessary for an intelligent person to look at the flaws of those close and dear to him, just as he does the flaws of those who are his opposition and who are distant from him. We ask Allah for assistance in this matter, Āmīn.

Some of the Incidents From His Life

These incidents and reports from the life of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه have been specifically chosen since the majority of what is mentioned about him is usually limited to the period of internal strife; whereas the other aspects of his life are often neglected or forgotten.

It is narrated by al-Tirmidhī (2414) by way of Suwayd ibn Naṣr, from 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak, from 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn al-Ward, from a man from the people of Madīnah who said:

Mu'āwiyah wrote to 'Ā'ishah – beginning with salām – then it read, “write a letter to me advising me but do not overburden me,” so 'Ā'ishah wrote back: “Peace be upon you. As for what follows, indeed I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying, ‘whoever seeks the pleasure of Allah with the wrath of the people, Allah shall suffice him from the people. And whoever seeks the peoples pleasure by the wrath of Allah, Allah will subject him to the people,’ and peace be upon you.”

He narrates a similar chain via Sufyān al-Thowrī, from Hishām ibn 'Urwah, from his father from 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها... but this version is Mowqūf. I say that the Mowqūf narration is more correct.

Ma'mar narrates in his *Jāmi'* (20717 in *Muṣannaf 'Abd al-Razzāq*) from al-Zuhrī, from Ḥumayd, from Miswar ibn Makhramah that he once went to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He said:

When I entered upon him – the narrator says I think he said I greeted – he asked me, “what has come of your accusing the leaders, O Miswar?” I said, “let us leave that aside; or let us discuss what I have come here for.” He said, “you shall speak what is on your chest”. Miswar said, “I did not leave anything with which I could fault him except that I told him about it.” Then he said, “I do not absolve myself from sins. Do you have sins that you fear destruction for yourself if Allah does not forgive you?” I said, “yes.” He

said, “what makes you more deserving of hope in Allah’s forgiveness than me? I swear by Allah, that which I take responsibility for with regards to resolving peoples disputes, upholding the penalties, engaging in jihād in the path of Allah, and the great matters which you cannot count, is much more than you have taken up on yourself. And I am upon a religion in which Allah accepts the good deeds and pardons the errors. And I swear by Allah, that whenever presented with a choice between Allah and others besides him I have always chosen Allah over anyone besides Him!” Miswar said: “I reflected upon what he said and realised that he had proven his point to me in this discussion.” And whenever Miswar thought of him he would pray for him.

Ibn ‘Asākir narrates in his *Tarīkh* (62/384) by way of Shu‘bah, from Simāk ibn Ḥarb, from ‘Alqamah ibn Wā’il, from his father [Wā’il ibn Hujr]:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ had allocated to me a portion of land and sent Mu‘āwiyah with me to identify it or to hand it over to me. Mu‘āwiyah said to me, “let me ride with you on your mount.” I said to him, “you shall not ride along with the kings.” [indicating that he preferred not to put Mu‘āwiyah behind him on his mount]. Then Mu‘āwiyah said, “let me wear your sandals,” and I said, “use the shade of the camel,” [meaning that Wā’il had sandals and Mu‘āwiyah was barefoot, since Wā’il did not allow him to ride at least he could lend him his shoes so that his feet do not burn on the desert sand. So, Wā’il told him to walk in the shade of the camel as he did not want to lend him his sandals as well.] He said: “When Mu‘āwiyah became the khalīfah I came to him and he sat me down next to him on his mattress and reminded me of the incident.” Simāk says that Wā’il said: “I wished then that I had let him ride in front of me.”

Ibn Kathīr has related in his *Tafsīr* (5/190):

Ibn Lahī‘ah narrated from Sālim ibn Ghaylān, from Sa‘īd ibn Abī Hilāl that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said to Ka‘b al-Aḥbār: “You say that Dhū al-Qarnayn used to tie his horse to [the star] al-Thurayyā?” So Ka‘b said: “If I say that then

Allah has also said, ‘We have endowed him with a means to all things...’”¹ And Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ reproaching Ka‘b is correct; and he is in the right since Mu‘āwiyah used to say about Ka‘b: “It is only on account of us fearing from him lies,” – referring to what he transmitted from his scrolls that they have been interpolated – not that Ka‘b would lie about what was in his scrolls. However, the nature of the scripture with Ka‘b is that is from the Israelite reports, much of which has been corrupted or interpolated or even fabricated, and we have absolutely no need for it after what has been told to us by Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. Indeed much harm has entered upon the people through these scriptures, and widespread corruption. As for the interpretation of Ka‘b of what Allah said, “We have endowed him with a means to all things...” and his proving that with what he finds in his scrolls that Dhū al-Qarnayn used to tie his horse at [the star] al-Thurayyā, it is not correct and not consistent [with reality] since that is beyond the power of man, as well as ascending toward the heavenly bodies. Allah says with regards to Bilqīs: “... and she was granted from everything.”² meaning the likeness of what kings would have been granted. Likewise, Dhū al-Qarnayn was granted these means and this was made easy for him by Allah so that he could conquer various lands, provinces and regions and he could bring the tyrants adown and humiliate the polytheists. He was granted all that was needed to perform these tasks, and Allah knows best.

Al-Bukhārī narrates with his chain in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* (564) from the narration of ‘Urwah who said:

I was seated with Mu‘āwiyah once and he inadvertently spoke to himself and then became aware. He said: “There is no forbearance without experience,” he repeated this thrice.

Mu‘āwiyah was a perfect example of forbearance such that Ibn Abī al-Dunyā had compiled a book on the forbearance of Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ as did Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim.

1 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 84

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 23

Abū Bakr al-Dīnwarī relates with his chain in his *Mujālasah* (2140) that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه once saw his son beating up a slave of his so he scolded him saying, “are you going to corrupt your manners by disciplining him?” and he was never seen beating a slave after that.

He also relates in his *Mujālasah* (801) with his chain from Abū Sufyān ibn al-‘Alā’ that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said:

My nature is more elevated than to let a misdeed be more weighty than my forbearance.

Ibn Abī al-Dunyā has related in *al-Ḥilm* (32) and in *al-Ishrāf* (337) with is chain from al-‘Alā’ who said that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said:

Red camels do not please me as much as spreading generosity.

It has also been narrated in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* of al-Balādhurī (5/32), from al-Madā’inī

Abū Zur‘ah al-Dimashqī relates in his *Tarīkh* (1/231) from Abū Yūsuf al-Ḥājib that Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī came do Damascus on one occasion and was staying in some dwelling; and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه used to come out at night to listen to his recitation.

He also relates (1/223) with his chain that Faḍālah ibn ‘Ubayd passed away during the era of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, so Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه carried his casket and instructed his son ‘Abd Allāh to join in since he would never carry the body of someone like him ever again.

He relates further (1/593) with his chain, from Qabīṣah ibn Jābir who said:

I went to Mu‘āwiyah and I presented my needs to him and he arranged for them to be seen to. I said: “You did not leave any of my needs unattended

to except one; and I will be clear as to what it is.” He asked what it was and I said to him, “who will take hold of affairs of state after you?” He said, “and of what interest is that to you?” I said, “why not, O Amīr al-Mu’minīn? By Allah, I am a very close relative, very loyal and noble.” He said, “appoint between four from the line of ‘Abd Manāf.” Then he said, “as for the nobleman of Quraysh, it is Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, as for its young man, in modesty, forbearance and generosity, then it is ibn ‘Āmir. As for Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī he is a Sayyid, noble. As for its reciter of the Book of Allah and its jurist in the religion and the one who is severe in upholding the penalties it is Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. As for ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar he is a man to himself. As for the one who reaches such and such, and is as cunning as a fox it is ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr.

Ya‘qūb ibn Sufyān relates in his *Tarīkh* (1/303) with his chain from Iyās ibn Abī Ramlah al-Shāmī:

He heard Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه asking Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه, “have you witnessed with the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم two ‘Īds occurring on the same day?” He said, “Yes,” and Mu‘āwiyah asked, “What did he do?” He answered, “he performed the ‘Id prayer and granted concession for the Friday prayer; those who wished to perform it may do so.”

He further relates in his *Tarīkh* (1/367-368) with his chain to Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf who said the he heard Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه while he was delivering a sermon in Madīnah saying:

I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying on this day: “This is the day of ‘Āshūrā’ [10th Muḥarram] and Allah has not ordained its fasting but I am fasting it. Those of you who wish to fast it may do so and those wish not to fast may eat.”

He further relates in his *Tarīkh* (1/413) with his chain to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Rabāḥ al-Sulamī that he prayed with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه the day he was stabbed in Jerusalem after completing the first Rak‘ah and when he was getting up for the second he

was stabbed and his reaction was nothing but raising his head from Sajdah when he said to the people, “complete your prayer,” so every person got up to complete what was left of the prayer, he did not call anyone forward [to lead] neither did anyone step forward.

He relates further in his *Tarīkh* in a lengthy narration (1/458) with his chain to Qabīṣah ibn Jābir who said:

I have accompanied Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and I have not seen a man with a clearer vision [for reading people and scenarios] and a companion with such forbearance than him, and I accompanied Ziyād and I have not seen a more generous companion than him and someone whose public and private life resembled each other so closely. And I have seen al-Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah and he was such a person that if he was in a city with eight gates and none could escape from it except through cunningness and resourcefulness he would have been able to escape.

He relates further in his *Tarīkh* (2/380-381) with his chain to Sulaym ibn ‘Āmir al-Khubā‘irī that once there was a drought and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه went out with the people of Damascus for *Istisqā’* [praying for rain]. When he sat on the *mimbar* [pulpit] he called for Yazīd ibn al-Aswad al-Jurashī. He was called and people made way for him until he approached the Mimbar and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه instructed him to ascend it while he sat at his feet. Then Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said: “O Allah we are asking You today on account of the best and most virtuous among us, we are asking on account of Yazīd ibn al-Aswad, O Yazīd raise your hands to Allah,” and Yazīd raised his hands and the people all raised their hands and very soon thereafter a cloud appeared from the west, the wind was blowing it with force and it began to rain that people almost did not make it to their homes due to the abundance of rain.

He relates further (2/410) with his chain to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamlah who said that once the people of Damascus were afflicted by drought. Leading the people was al-Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Qays al-Fihri and he went out with the people for *Istisqā’*. He asked

where Yazīd ibn al-Aswad was, but no one responded. He repeatedly called out for Yazīd ibn al-Aswad and demanded that if he is present that he comes forward. A person wearing a *Burnus* [a cloak with a hood] came forward and when he stood facing the people he lowered the hood to his shoulders and raised his hands: “O my Lord, the people have asked of me that you send down the rains,” the people returned to their homes drenched in the rain water, then Yazīd said: “O Allah, he has exposed me so grant me comfort from him.” It was not even a week that passed when al-Ḍaḥḥāk was killed. And with the same chain he relates that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه paid on behalf of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها 18000 gold coins.

He relates further (2/479) with his chain to al-Awzā’ī that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the first to sit during the first khuṭbah of Fridays, and his excuse for that was his advanced age.

He narrates further in his *Tarīkh* (3/373) with his chain to Hishām ibn ‘Urwah, from his father who said:

I entered upon Mu‘āwiyah and he asked me where is *al-Maslūl* [the name of a document]; and I told him it was with me. He then said, “by Allah, I had written it with my own hand. Abū Bakr was allocating a piece of land for Zubayr and I was recording it. Then ‘Umar approached and Abū Bakr took it at placed it in the fold of the mattress; and when he [‘Umar] entered he said, ‘it seems as if you are having a private discussion?’ and Abū Bakr replied in the affirmative. So ‘Umar left and Abū Bakr brought out the book again and I completed it [writing the document].

Abū Dāwūd narrates in his *Sunan* (2753) with his chain to Sulaym ibn ‘Āmir, a man of Ḥimyar, said:

There was a covenant between Mu‘āwiyah and the Romans, and he was going towards their territory, and when the covenant came to an end, he attacked them. A man came on a horse, or a packhorse saying, Allah is Most Great, Allah is Most Great; let there be faithfulness and not

treachery. And when they looked they found that he was ‘Amr ibn ‘Abasah. Mu‘āwiyah sent for him and questioned him (about that). He said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say, ‘when one has covenant with people he must not tighten or release it till its term comes to an end or he brings it to an end in agreement with them (to make both the parties equal),’ so Mu‘āwiyah returned.

Aḥmad narrates it (4/111) as well as al-Tirmidhī (1580) and he said regarding it, “Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ”. However, Abū Ḥātim – as mentioned in the *Marāsīl* of his son (310) – said:

Sulaym ibn ‘Āmir did not meet ‘Amr ibn ‘Abasah

Regarding the Authentic Ḥadīth, “The Rebellious Party Will Kill ‘Ammār,” and Relating it to Other Texts

Al-Bukhārī narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2657) with his chain to ‘Ikrimah who said that Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه instructed him and ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh to go to Abū Sa‘īd and listen to some of his narrations; so they both went (and saw) Abū Sa‘īd and his brother were irrigating a garden belonging to them. When he saw them, he came up to them and sat down with his legs drawn up and wrapped in his garment and said:

(During the construction of the Prophet’s Maṣjid) we carried the bricks of the maṣjid, one brick at a time while ‘Ammār used to carry two at a time. The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم passed by ‘Ammār and removed the dust off his head and said, “may Allah be merciful to ‘Ammār. He will be killed by a rebellious aggressive group. ‘Ammār will call them to (obey) Allah and they will invite him to the Fire.”

Muslim also narrates (2915) via Abū Naḍrah, from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه who said:

Someone who is better than I informed me, that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said to ‘Ammār as he was wiping over his head: “O son of Sumayyah, you will be involved in trouble and a group of the rebels would kill you.”

Muslim also narrates it from Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها (2916) that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said to ‘Ammār رضي الله عنه:

The rebellious party will kill you.

I say: this narration is authentic; rather it is *Mutawātir* [widely narrated], as some of the scholars have said.¹ And the meaning of this report is evidently clear; it

1 See *al-Istī‘āb* (2/481) of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *al-Dhahabī Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (1/421), and Ibn Ḥajar *al-Iṣābah* (2/512).

does not require much explanation; and that is that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was the closest to the truth and that ‘Ammār would be killed by the rebellious party as is the purport of the ḥadīth. This is from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم foretelling events which he had been privy to, from the realm of the unseen, and a sign of prophethood. Things happened exactly as he foretold as is known by all. However, it is imperative to add to the existing texts those texts which indicate the Islam of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه as well as his status as a Ṣaḥābī in addition to his merits; and some of that has been mentioned in the pages before this.

Allah says:

If two parties from the believers fight each other; then bring about reconciliation between them...¹

Al-Bukhārī narrates (2924) by way of ‘Umayr ibn al-Aswad that he came to ‘Ubadah ibn al-Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه when he was descending upon Ḥimṣ in a structure of his and with him was Umm Ḥarām - ‘Umayr says – she narrated to us that she heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, saying: “The first army to fight in the sea; [Paradise] will be incumbent for them.” So she asked the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم if she would be one of them and he said, “You are among them.”

Al-Bukhārī (2799-2800) narrates it by way of al-Layth, through Anas ibn Mālīk, from his aunt Umm Ḥarām bint Malḥān and he mentioned the narration; and at the end he says:

The first naval expedition by the Muslims was by Mu‘āwiyah.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *ibn Faṭḥ al-Bārī* (6/90):

... and Mu‘āwiyah was the first to undertake a naval expedition and that was during the era of ‘Uthmān. Mu‘āwiyah was the leader of that navy.²

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9

2 See *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr* (2/601), *Ibn ‘Asākir*, and *Ibn Kathīr* (10/228)

He also states (6/77):

Ibn Wahb has narrated in his *Muwattaʿa* from Ibn Lahīʿah, from those whom he has heard from, who said: “Muʿāwiyah was the first to undertake a naval expedition during the time of ʿUthmān.”

ʿAbd al-Razzāq narrates in his *Muṣannaf* (9629) from Maʿmar, from Zayd ibn Aslam, From ʿAṭāʾ ibn Yasār that the wife of Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه said:

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was once sleeping and he awoke smiling [almost laughing], so I said, “is it at me that you laugh, O Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم?” He responded, “no, but there will be a group from my ummah who will be riding on the sea – in a naval expedition – it is as if they are seated on thrones like kings.” He slept again and when he awoke he awoke smiling [almost laughing] and again I asked if it was me who he was laughing and he said, “no, it is for that group of my ummah who will undertake this naval expedition. They will return with little booty, but they will be forgiven.” She said, “ask Allah to make me from them,” so he prayed for her.

ʿAṭāʾ says:

I had seen her during one of the military campaigns let by Mundhir ibn al-Zubayr to the Roman territories and she was with us; and she passed away in those Roman lands.

I say: this narration, its chain is sound. However, there is no doubt that the narrations in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections are even more authentic even though the meaning is similar. Ibn Ḥajar has authenticated this narration according to the standards of al-Bukhārī, however he treated these as two separate incidents and he discussed this at length (6/83) and the more plausible case is that it was a single incident. I say further that if one combines the texts and looks at them jointly, the matter becomes clearer and some of the scholars have mentioned this matter and also explained some of what has been explained.¹

1 *Al-Tadhkirah* by al-Qurṭubī (3/189)

Ya'qūb ibn Shaybah in his *Musnad*, under the *Musnad* of 'Ammār has mentioned the reports of 'Ammār and said:

I heard Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal being asked about the ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ with regards to 'Ammār, “the rebellious party will kill you,” so Aḥmad said, ‘the rebellious party did kill him as mentioned by the Prophet ﷺ and said, “this narration is not authentic from the Prophet ﷺ, “and he disliked to speak further on this.”¹

Ibn Ḥazm says in *al-Fiṣal* (4/124):

... as for the matter of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, it is contrary to that and 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not fight him due to his withholding his pledge as there was latitude in that for him as there was for Ibn 'Umar رضي الله عنه, instead he fought him for the sake of not carrying out his instructions in all the regions of al-Shām; and he was the Imām whose obedience was necessary so 'Alī was in the right in this matter. Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, on the other hand, never ever denied the virtue of 'Alī رضي الله عنه or his legitimacy to the leadership. However, his ijtihād led him to the view of giving precedence to seeking retribution for the murder of 'Uthmān above pledging his allegiance to 'Alī رضي الله عنه; and he saw himself in a better position for seeking retribution and speaking on his behalf; a position above the sons of 'Uthmān and the sons of Ḥakam ibn Abī al-Āṣ, on account of his age and his ability to enact revenge. Just as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ instructed 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Sahl, the brother of 'Abd Allāh ibn Sahl who was murdered at Khaybar, to remain silent even though he was the brother of the victim; instead he said, “the elders, the elders,” so 'Abd al-Raḥmān remained silent and Muḥayyiṣah and Ḥuwayyiṣah ibn Mas'ūd spoke instead, and they were the paternal cousins of the deceased; since they were older than the brother of the deceased. So Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه did not demand this matter except that he felt he had a right to do so; especially if one considers the narration we have just mentioned. All that he erred in was giving preference to this above the

1 See *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/414)

pledge, that is all. So, he received a single reward for his juristic effort and no sin even though he was deprived of being correct just as all others who err in their ijtihād of whom the Prophet ﷺ reported that they receive a single reward and the one whose ijtihād is correct receives two rewards.

There is nothing more astonishing than those who permit ijtihad which results in the shedding of blood, or permitting conjugal relations, or in matters of wealth, or other matters of the sharī'ah where some prohibit and others permit, and others obligate; yet they excuse those who err in these matters. They allow this for al-Layth, Abū Ḥanīfah, al-Thowrī, Mālik, al-Shāfi'ī, Aḥmad, Dāwūd, Ishāq, Abū Thowr and others like Zufar, Abū Yūsuf, Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan, Ḥasan ibn Ziyād, Ibn al-Qāsim, Ashhab, Ibn al-Mājishūn, al-Muzanī and others besides them.

So one of these will permit the blood of a person and the other will prohibit it; like bandits or homosexuals and other matters besides this, which are many. Some of them would allow relations with a particular woman and others would prohibit; like a virgin who has been married off by her father without her permission, even though she is sane and mature. There are many other examples besides this one. Likewise, this is the case in many other matters of the sharī'ah.

This is what the Mu'tazilah have done with their scholars like Wāṣil, 'Amr, and their other scholars and jurists; as did the Khawārij with their jurists and muftīs. Then they become restrictive on this matter with those who combine companionship with the Prophet ﷺ, and merit, knowledge and ijtihād like Mu'āwiyah and 'Amr and others besides them from the Ṣaḥābah. All they have done was do ijtihād in matters where the shedding of blood was the consequence just as the muftīs do. Some muftīs consider it necessary to execute the sorcerer and others do not share this view; some of them allow the capital punishment to be enacted on a free person over the murder of a slave, and others disagree; some of them consider it valid that a believer be executed over a disbeliever and others disagree. So what is different between this ijtihād and the ijtihād of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه; besides the blind ignorance of some and confusing matters of which they have no knowledge!

We are well aware that if someone has an obligatory duty and he resists fulfilling it and is prepared to fight on account of it; then it is the duty of the Imām to fight such a person, even if the person’s actions are on account of *Ta’wīl* [justified interpretation]. And that does not affect a person’s moral integrity and virtue; neither does it necessitate a form of major sin. Instead he is rewarded for his *ijtihād* and intention in seeking out what he considered best. Based on this we say without hesitation that the right was with ‘Alī and he was correct, we also acknowledge the legitimacy of his leadership and that he will receive two rewards; one for his *ijtihād* and the other for arriving at the correct solution. Likewise, we say with absolute conviction that Mu‘āwiyah and those who sided with him had erred, and they shall receive a single reward.

Also, the authentic ḥadīth of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has that he described a party of dissidents, who will defact from within one of two parties and the party, from the two parties, which is closest to the truth will fight these dissidents. And such a defecting party came about, they were known as the *Khawārij* and it was the party of ‘Alī who fought them. The authentic narration from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is “the rebellious party shall kill ‘Ammār”.

The Mujtahid who errs, if he fights on account of what he believes to be the truth, seeking the grace of Allah with a sincere intention, not knowing that he is in the wrong, then he will be a rebellious party and he will be rewarded [for his *ijtihād*]. There is to be no implementation of the *Ḥadd* [legal punishment]. As for one who fights, knowing that he is in the wrong, then this is an enemy combatant upon whom the *Ḥadd* ought to be applied as well as retaliation. Such a person is attributed to sin and going against the leader, not a Mujtahid in error. The explanation for that can be found in the verse: “If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah’s command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice,” – and this is exactly what we are saying, without a farfetched interpretation, nor deviation from the apparent meaning of the verse.

Allah refers to them as rebellious believers; they are brothers to each other even while they are fighting each other. And the other party is the one upon the right stance, upon justice, those who have been rebelled against and who have been commanded with seeking out reconciliation between themselves and the rebellious party. Allah did not describe them with *fisq* on account of the fighting; neither did He describe them with any deficiency in faith. All that they are is that they are rebels who have erred, they were not seeking the blood of the other party. ‘Ammār was killed by Abū al-Ghādiyah al-Juhanī, who is said to be a Ṣaḥābī. So, Abū al-Ghādiyah is a person who did *ta’wīl*, and *ijtihād*, in which he erred and he rebelled, yet he receives a single reward for his *ijtihād*. He is not like the murderers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه since there was no scope for *ijtihād* in his murder رضي الله عنه; since he did not kill anyone, nor did he ambush or rob, nor did he defend himself, nor did he commit fornication, nor did he renegade on the faith any of which would give reason for *ta’wīl*. As a matter of fact, those who murdered him are described with open sin, they are armed attackers, spillers of innocent blood with no just cause or juristic interpretation that justifies it. They are accured sinners.

So if this affair is rendered baseless and it is proven correct that ‘Alī is in the right, then the narrations of remaining in one’s home and not getting involved in the fighting they apply without a doubt to those who were uncertain about which party was in the right. And that is what we say. So when the truth becomes apparent it becomes mandatory to fight the rebelling party by the text of the Qur’ān. And if both parties are rebellious then it is necessary to fight them both since the words of Allah do not contradict what His Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم says as both are essentially from Allah, as He says: “He does not speak of his own desire. It is only divine revelation being revealed to him,”¹ and He says, “...and if it were from others beside Allah they would have found much contradiction in it.”² Therefore we know with certainty that all that the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم says is from Allah; if that is so then there is nothing from Allah which is contradictory, All praise is due to Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Qamar: 3,4

2 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 82

All that remains is to speak about the objections on why ‘Alī fought, so we say – and with Allah is our towfīq:

As for what they say about avenging the murder of ‘Uthmān, and the duty of taking his murderers to task is mandatory; those who bear arms against Allah and His Prophet ﷺ, and who spread evil and corruption on earth and those who have desecrated the sanctity of the religion, the sacred sanctuary of Madīnah, the vestige of leadership, and the sanctity of those who are Ṣaḥābah, then yes it is mandatory.

‘Alī عليه السلام did not oppose them in this matter ever, nor in distancing himself from those who were involved. However, they were a very large number and he had no means against them. Since he was not in a position to take action, the obligation of doing so was lifted from him; just as it is lifted from every Muslim who does not have the capacity to fulfil his religious duties such as prayer, fasting, ḥajj etc., there is no difference. Allah says in the Qur’ān:

Allah does not burden any soul with more than it can bear...¹

The Prophet ﷺ said:

If I have instructed you with anything, then perform it to the extent of your capacity.

And had Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام given the pledge to ‘Alī عليه السلام he would have given him the necessary support to take the murderers of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام to task. So it is correct to say that the division is one of the major factors that kept ‘Alī from enacting justice and were it not for that he would have been in a position to deal with the murderers of ‘Uthmān as he did with the murderers of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khubbāb since he was in a position to deal with them.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 286

As for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه following the example of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه with delaying in given his pledge with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه; then there is no example in what is wrong. And ‘Alī رضي الله عنه reassessed his position and soon afterwards he gave his pledge to Abū Bakr. So, if Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه followed him in that he would have been correct and all the Ṣaḥābah would have given their pledge without doubt since many of them withheld giving the pledge on account of the division. Even if the status of others besides ‘Alī were close to his, like Ṭalḥah, Zubayr and Sa‘d; his pledge was given first and he was nominated as the legitimate Imām whose obedience is obligatory in what he instructs of the religion and there is little consideration for the fact that others of a similar status were present; since the pledge was previously given to ‘Uthmān and even though they were all close in status, ‘Uthmān was the leader and it was mandatory to obey him. And if at the time of consultation, someone other than ‘Uthmān, like ‘Alī or Ṭalḥah or Zubayr or ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, were to have been elected then that individual would have been the Imām and it would have been binding on ‘Uthmān to obey that Imām. If that was the case before ‘Uthmān, it ought to apply after his murder as well.

So, Alī sought his own right and he fought him; although he was at liberty not to enforce his right and he could have let them be so that Muslim unity would prevail; as his son Ḥasan رضي الله عنه had done. As the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said of him:

This son of mine is a Sayyid; and perhaps Allah will bring about reconciliation at his hands between two great groups from my ummah.

And the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم was very delighted with him on account of this. Whoever forgoes his right to prevent the shedding of innocent blood has indeed achieved merit and virtue beyond which cannot be achieved. As for one who chooses to fight then that is his right, and there is no blame on such a person and he is correct in such a stance; and with Allah is all towfīq.

Ibn al-‘Arabī has stated in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (1/171-174):

That which will bring coolness to your chest is that the Prophet ﷺ mentioned the communal strife and gave indications and warned about the Khawārij when he said, “the closest of the two groups to the truth...” so he explained that each of these two groups has an attachment with the truth; however the group of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was closer to it. Allah says: “If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah’s command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice,”¹ and He did not exclude the rebellious party from the faith because their insubordination was on account of juristic interpretation; neither did He strip them of the description of brotherhood since He says after that, “indeed the believers are brothers; so reconcile between your two brothers...”² The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said of ‘Ammār, “the rebellious party will kill him,” and he said with regards to Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, “this son of mine is a sayyid; and perhaps Allah will bring about reconciliation at his hands between two major groups from the Muslims.” So Ḥasan’s رضي الله عنه part in all of this was that he abdicated and brought about reconciliation.

Ibn Taymiyyah has stated in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/467-468):

... even though what is in the narration regarding ‘Ammār is that the rebellious group will kill him could refer to those individuals who physically did the terrible deed of killing him, they are the rebels because they fought for a reason other than that; and it is possible that they were not rebels before the fighting... and ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah were the most desirous of preventing bloodshed; more than the fighters themselves. However, they were overcome by what really happened and such fitnah, when it spreads, even the most wise people are incapable of extinguishing such a fire. And in both camps there were individuals like al-Ashtar al-Nakhaṭī, Ḥāshim ibn ‘Utbah al-Mirqāl, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd, Abū al-A‘war

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9

2 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 10

al-Sulamī and the likes of them who encouraged the fighting. These are people who; some of them will stand up in defence of ‘Uthmān to the extent of fanaticism and others who would flee from him; and some who would stand up in defence of ‘Alī who were extreme and others who would flee him.

Thereafter, those who fought on the side of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه did not do so merely for the sake of Mu‘āwiyah, but for other reasons. And such fighting which resembles the fighting of the period of Jāhiliyyah it is very difficult for those involved in it that their objectives and beliefs regarding it be aligned; as al-Zuhrī said: “The fitnah occurred and the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم were present; and they were unanimous that any blood, or wealth, or private part that had been violated on account of misinterpretation of the Qur’ān then that ought to be dealt with as one deals with the incidents of Jāhiliyyah [i.e. do not consider it part of the religion].

He states further (4/498-499):

... also Allah says in His Book, “if two groups among the believers fight each other then seek to reconcile...” so He has made them believers and brothers despite the fighting and rebelling. It has also been established in the authentic narrations that the Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم said: “a group will defect which will be fought by the party which is closest to the truth,” and Nabī صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم, also said: “Indeed this son of mine is a sayyid...” and he said to ‘Ammār, “the rebellious party will kill you,” note that he did not say disbelievers. And these narrations are authentic according to the scholars, and have been narrated by variant chains; none of them taking from the other, and this is what indicates absolute certainty in these narrations. The Prophet صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم said that the two divided parties are both Muslims, and he praised the one who brought about reconciliation among them. He further predicted that a group would dissent and that the closes of the two parties would fight them.

The objector says, “he fought ‘Alī who was the fourth khalīfah and the legitimate leader; and whoever fights the leader is a rebel and tyrant.” We say: Yes, but the rebel could be a person who has done ta’wīl; believing that he is upon the truth. And his rebellion could be a combination of ta’wīl, seeking fame, as well as a misunderstanding, and this is most common. And out of every possibility this one does not apply. We do not declare him, nor those superior to him, free from sin and error. The famous incident with Miswar ibn Makhramah testifies to this. Miswar said: “I did not leave anything with which I could fault him except that I told him about it.” Then he said, “I do not absolve myself from sins. Do you have sins that you fear destruction for yourself if Allah does not forgive you? Miswar said, “Yes.” and he said, “what makes you more deserving of hope in Allah’s forgiveness than me? I swear by Allah, that which I take responsibility for with regards to resolving peoples disputes, upholding the penalties, engaging in jihād in the path of Allah, and the great matters which you cannot count, is much more than you have taken up on yourself. And I am upon a religion in which Allah accepts the good deeds and pardons the errors. And I swear by Allah, that whenever presented with a choice between Allah and others besides him I have always chosen Allah over anyone besides Him!” Miswar said, “I reflected upon what he said and realised that he had proven his point to me in this discussion.” And whenever Miswar thought of him he would pray for him.

If it is said that they are rebels since the Prophet ﷺ told ‘Ammār that the rebellious party will kill him; then we say: the narration is sound; although some have questioned it and others have said that the wording refers to seeking – and this view amounts to nothing. As for the earlier generation, like Abū Ḥanīfah, Mālik, Aḥmad and others like them; they say that the prerequisite for fighting the rebellious party is not present since Allah had not commanded with fighting to begin with. Rather, He instructed that if fighting does occur there is to be reconciliation between them. Then, if one party transgresses against the other it is necessary to fight the transgressing party. Therefore, Mālik and Aḥmad considered this

fighting a fitnah. And Abū Ḥanīfah used to say that it is not permitted to fight the transgressing party until they begin fighting with the Imām, as did these.

Thereafter, the Ahl al-Sunnah say that the legitimate Imām is not infallible and it is not imperative on a person to fight alongside him against everyone who opposes him; nor to obey him in what the person knows to be wrong and to leave it would be better. It is on this basis that a group of the Ṣaḥābah abandoned fighting on the side of ‘Alī against the army from al-Shām. As for those who fought against him, they are one of the following. They are either sinners, or Mujtahids who were either correct or erred in their ijtihād. And on every possibility it does not cast an allegation on their faith; neither does it bar them from Paradise on account of what Allah says: “If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah’s command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice. Indeed the believers are brother; so reconcile between your two brothers...” so he called them brothers.

Ibn Kathīr says in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (3/218):

This narration is from the signs of prophethood since the Prophet ﷺ predicted that ‘Ammār would be killed by the rebellious group, and he was killed by the army from al-Shām on the occasion of Ṣiffīn and ‘Ammār was on the side of ‘Alī in the army of the people of ‘Irāq. And ‘Alī was more deserving in the matter than Mu‘āwiyah. It is not necessary that the naming of the party of Mu‘āwiyah رافضی as rebels that they become disbelievers as the ignorant, deviant Shī‘ah and others attempt to infer; since Mu‘āwiyah and those with him, even though they were rebels they were people who had done ta’wīl at the same time. And every Mujtahid is not necessarily correct, actually the one who is correct receives double reward and the one who errs gets a single reward. As for those who have added to the

narration regarding ‘Ammar, “may Allah not allow them my intercession on the Day of Judgement,” then this addition is a lie and fabrication against the Messenger of Allah ﷺ since he did not say that; neither has it been transmitted from a reliable source, and Allah knows best.

As for the phrase, “he calls them to Paradise and they call him to the Fire,” it is because ‘Ammār and those with him were calling to unity and the people of al-Shām were monopolising the affair and not those who were more deserving of it, in addition to their being a leader for every region. This will only lead to further division and differences within the ummah; as that is what their stance necessitates even though that is not what they intended, and Allah knows best.

How beautiful is what al-Dhahabī said in his *Siyar* (3/128):

So we praise Allah for our well-being that He brought us into existence in a time when the truth has become clear and unambiguous from both sides. We know where both sides are taking their opinion from; and we have become well-informed and aware and we have excused and sought forgiveness for and love within moderation. We have asked for mercy for the rebellious party by a broad interpretation in general; or on account of error –with Allah’s permission – which may be forgiven. And we say, as Allah has taught us, “O our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who have preceded us in faith; and place not in our hearts enmity towards those who believe.”

We also pray for the pleasure of Allah to be upon those who avoided both parties like Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ and Ibn ‘Umar and Muḥammad ibn Maslamah and Sa’īd ibn Zayd among others.

We also absolve ourselves from the dissident Khawārij who fought ‘Alī and declared both parties disbelievers. So the Khawārij are the dogs of the Fire, they have defected from the religion; and with all that we do not say with conviction that they are permanently in the Fire as we say for the worshipers of idols and crosses.

Referencing the Ḥadīth of Abū Bakrah, “Indeed This Son of Mine is a Sayyid.”

Al-Bukhārī narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2704) from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad – who said – Sufyān narrated to me from Abū Mūsā who heard from Ḥasan (al-Baṣrī) saying:

By Allah, Ḥasan bin ‘Alī led large battalions like mountains against Mu‘āwiyah. ‘Amr bin al-‘Āṣ said (to Mu‘āwiyah), “I surely see battalions which will not turn back before killing their opponents.” Mu‘āwiyah who was really the best of the two men said to him, “O ‘Amr! If these killed those and those killed these, who would be left with me for the jobs of the public, who would be left with me for their women, who would be left with me for their children?” Then Mu‘āwiyah sent two men from Quraysh from the tribe of ‘Abd al-Shams called ‘Abd al-Raḥmān bin Samurah and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āmir bin Kurayz to Ḥasan saying to them, “go to this man (i.e. Ḥasan) and negotiate peace with him and talk and appeal to him.” So, they went to Ḥasan and talked and appealed to him to accept peace. Ḥasan said, “we, the offspring of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, have got no wealth and people have indulged in killing and corruption (and money only will appease them).” They said to Ḥasan, “Mu‘āwiyah offers you so and so, and appeals to you and entreats you to accept peace.” Ḥasan said to them, “but who will be responsible for what you have said?” They said, “we will be responsible for it.” So, whatever Ḥasan asked they said, “we will be responsible for it for you.” So, Ḥasan concluded a peace treaty with Mu‘āwiyah.

Ḥasan (al-Baṣrī) said:

I heard Abu Bakrah saying, “I saw the Messenger of Allah ﷺ on the mimbar and Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī was by his side. The Prophet ﷺ was looking at the people and then at Ḥasan bin ‘Alī saying, “This son of mine is a sayyid; and may Allah make peace between two big groups of Muslims through him.”

Al-Bukhārī said:

‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh [ibn al-Madīnī] said: “It is only through this narration that we have established that Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.”

I say: This narration has been narrated by Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and there is a difference in its narration from him. Some have narrated it from him from Abū Bakrah, some from Anas, and some from Umm Salamah and some have narrated it from him Mursal.

As for those who narrate it from him, from Abū Bakrah it has various chains.

The First Chain

Narrated by Isrā’īl — from Abū Mūsā — from al-Baṣrī — from him, that he said I heard Abū Bakrah. This is how it has been narrated by Ibn al-Madīnī in *al-Bukhārī* (7109)¹, and by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad in *al-Bukhārī* as well (2704), and by Ṣadaqah ibn al-Faḍl al-Marwazī in *al-Bukhārī* (3746) as well as Aḥmad in the *Musnad* (5/37-38) and (1354) in *Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah*; and by Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr as in *al-Nasā’ī al-Kubrā* (1718,10081) and *al-Ṣughrā* (3/107); and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbād in the *Sunan* of al-Bayhaqī (6/165); and al-Ḥumaydī in his *Musnad* (2/348); and Sa’īd ibn Manṣūr in *al-Bayhaqī* (8/173) and Ibrahīm ibn Bashshār ibn *al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī (3/33) – all of them from Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah — from Isrā’īl [Abū Mūsā] — who said — I heard Ḥasan saying, “I heard Abū Bakrah...”²

It has also been narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa’īd in al-Nasā’ī’s *al-Kubrā* (8156); and Khalaf ibn Khalīfah by al-Bazzār (9/109) and from Abū Khaythamah by al-Bayhaqī (7/63); all of them from Ibn ‘Uyaynah — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan, — from Abū Bakrah; however there is not explicit mention of Ḥasan hearing it.

1 Al-Bukhārī narrates it from Ibn al-Madīnī in *al-Awsaṭ* (1/637) as well.

2 Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fath* (13/62): “Al-Isma’īlī has narrated it from seven people from Sufyān and mentioned the variations in their wordings.”

Al-Bazzār says after his narration:

The narration of Isrāʾīl Abū Mūsā, we do not know of anyone narrating it from him besides Ibn ʿUyaynah.

After mentioning what al-Bazzār has said, Ibn Ḥajar, in his *Fath* (13/63) says:

Mughlaṭay has corrected him on the basis of narrating in the chapter *ʿAlāmat al-Nubuwwah* by way of Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī al-Juʿfī, from Abū Mūsā — who is Isrāʾīl — and it is a good correction. However, I have not seen the entire incident and he merely mentions the prophetic narration on its own.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad also narrates it as in *al-Bukhārī* (3629) from Yaḥya ibn Ādam, from Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī from Abū Mūsā, from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah — without express mention of hearing it from Abū Bakrah.

Ibn Abī Shaybah narrates it from Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī, from Abū Mūsā, from Ḥasan — Mursal

The Second Chain

This has been narrated by Mubarak ibn Faḍālah, from Ḥasan — who said — Abū Bakrah told me... this has been narrated by Aḥmad in his *Musnad* (5/44):

Hāshim narrated to us — who said — al-Mubārak narrated to us — who said — Ḥasan narrated to us — who said — Abū Bakrah narrated to me.

It has also been narrated by al-Bazzar (9/109) from Aḥmad ibn Manṣūr al-Ramādī, from Abū Dāwūd, from Abū Faḍālah — who is Mubārak ibn Faḍālah — from Ḥasan who said:

Abū Bakrah narrated to me...

Al-Bazzār said after this narration:

This narration is narrated from Jābir and Abū Bakrah, and the narration of Abū Bakrah is more famous and has a better chain; whereas the narration of Jābir is rarer. Therefore we have narrated the version of this from Abū Bakrah.

Thereafter he narrates it (9/111) from Aḥmad ibn Maṣṣūr, and Ibn Ḥibbān (6964) from Abū Khalīfah, al-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥubāb, both of them from Abul Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī from him, but without expressly saying he heard it.

After which al-Bazzār says:

This narration has also been narrated from Abū Saʿīd¹ and Abū Bakrah; as for Mubārak ibn Faḍālah; there is no harm in him, and many of the scholars have narrated from him.

The Third Chain

It has been narrated from Ashʿath ibn ʿAbd al-Malik² — from him — from Abū Bakrah.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Anṣārī narrates it from him as in *Abū Dāwūd* (4629) and *al-Tirmidhī* (3773) and al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (3/34) as well as al-Ḥākim (3/174). Al-Tirmidhī said:

This Ḥadīth is Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ

The Fourth Chain

ʿAlī ibn Zayd ibn Judʿān narrates it from him, from Abū Bakrah.

¹ See *Kashf al-Astār* (2638)

² He has been identified as such in *al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī.

It has been narrated from him by Mūsāddad in *Abū Dāwūd* (4629), and Muslim ibn Ibrāhīm in *Abū Dāwūd* (4629) and al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (3/33), and ‘Ārim in Ṭabarānī’s *al-Kabīr* (3/33), and Yaḥyā ibn Ḥabīb ibn ‘Arabī in *al-Bazzār* (9/109), and ‘Affān ibn Muslim and Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb in *al-Hākim* (3/174) — all of them from Ḥammad ibn Zayd — from ‘Alī ibn Zayd...

Al-Bazzar said after it:

The narration of ‘Alī ibn Zayd, from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah, we do not know of it being narrated from ‘Alī except from Ḥammād ibn Zayd.

The Fifth Chain

It has been narrated from Ismā‘īl ibn Muslim — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah.

As narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (3/34), from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Salm, from Sahl ibn ‘Uthmān, from Abū Mu‘āwiyah, from Ismā‘īl...

Ismā‘īl ibn Muslim al-Makkī, even though a scholar, is abandoned.

The Sixth Chain

Narrated by Abū al-Ashhab Ja‘far ibn Ḥayyān — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah.

This has been narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (2/147) and *al-Kabīr* (3/34) — from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣadaqaḥ — from ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūsuf al-Jubayrī — from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī — from Abū al-Ashhab...

The Seventh Chain

Narrated by Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind — from al-Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah.

This has been narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (3/245) — from Aslam ibn Sahl al-Wasiṭī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī al-Shaybānī — from ‘Abd al-Ḥakam ibn Manṣūr

— from Dāwūd with the above chain, he said:

No one has narrated this from Dāwūd except ‘Abd al-Ḥakam ibn Maṣṣūr.

The Eighth Chain

Narrated by Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd and Maṣṣūr ibn Zādhān — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah.

This has been narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Ṣaghīr* (766) and *al-Kabīr* (3/34) — from Rabī ibn Sualymān — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Shaybah al-Jaddī — from Hushaym, with this chain — and he said none narrate it from Yūnus except Hushaym, and none from Hushaym except Ibn Shaybah, and he narrates it in isolation.

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Shaybah, Abū Ḥātim says of him:

I do not know him, but his narrations are fine and al-Nabatī included him in *Dhayl al-Ḍu‘afā’*. I say that perhaps his inclusion is on account of him not being known, and Allah knows best.

The Ninth Chain

Narrated by Ma‘mar — who said — someone who heard Ḥasan narrating from Abū Bakrah narrated to me.

It can be found in his *Jāmi‘* (11/452), by way of ‘Abd al-Razzāq; and from him (5/47).

This brings the total of the chains for the narration of Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah, to nine. Express hearing has been found in the first two chains and the balance have not mentioned this [instead they are ‘an‘anah, i.e. narrated with the word “from”].

As for the Narrations from Anas

Al-Nasā'ī said in *al-Kubrā* (5/49):

Ismā'īl ibn Mas'ūd narrated to me — from Khālid ibn Hārith — from Ash'ath — from Ḥasan — from some of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ — meaning Anas — who said: “I had seen the Messenger of Allah ﷺ delivering a sermon and Ḥasan was on his thigh; and he spoke whatever he meant to say then he turned to Ḥasan and kissed him and said: ‘O Allah, I love him, so You love him as well,’ and he said: ‘anticipate that he will reconcile between two groups of my ummah.’

He narrates further (5/49) with his chain to Ash'ath — from Ḥasan — from some of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ — meaning Anas — who said:

I entered upon the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and Ḥasan and Ḥusayn were crawling over his belly and he said, “my two flowers from my ummah.”

He also narrated this in *Khaṣā'is 'Alī* (144).

And he narrates in *'Amal al-Yowm wa al-Laylah* (253) with his chain to Ash'ath — from Ḥasan — from some of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ — meaning Anas — who said:

I had seen the Messenger of Allah ﷺ delivering a sermon and Ḥasan was on his thigh, then he said: “I anticipate this son of mine to be a sayyid; and that Allah will bring about reconciliation at his hands between two parties of my ummah.”

Al-Bazzar also narrates it — see *Kashf al-Astar* — from Ash'ath — from Ḥasan... he said:

I think it is from Anas.

As for the Narration of Umm Salamah

I have not come across it except that al-Mizzi, in *al-Tuḥfa* (9/39), said that it is narrated from her via Ḥasan.

As for the Mursal Narration

It has been narrated by Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād *al-Fitan* (423), Ibn Abī Shaybah in his *Muṣannaf* (6/376)— from Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī — from Abū Mūsā Isrā‘īl — from Ḥasan, Mursal. Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah (4/131) by way of Ibn Mahdī — from Sahl ibn Abī al-Ṣalt — from Ḥasan, Mursal. Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasā‘ī said, after mentioning the ḥadīth from ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān and Isrā‘īl Abū Mūsā and Ash‘ath, “‘Awf, Dāwūd and Hishām all narrate it Mursal,” and he gave his chain to each of those Mursal narrations.

Analysis of This Ḥadīth

This ḥadīth, there is no doubt of its correctness going up to Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] since there is such a large number of narrators who narrate it from him. However, the difference of opinion arises from him onwards, as has been laid out in detail in the section on the referencing of this narration. There are four paths by which it is narrated:

1. Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه
2. Ḥasan — from Anas رضي الله عنه
3. Ḥasan — from Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها
4. the Mursal narration from Ḥasan

As for the second path, it seems to be a mistake and that Khālīd ibn al-Ḥārith he is the one who said, “meaning Anas”. It appears as though the narration of Ash‘ath, from Ḥasan only has “some the companions”, and it seems as though Khālīd is the one who said, “meaning Anas”; on account of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī narrating it from him [Ash‘ath] — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.¹

The other possibility is that this statement is from the Ash‘ath and it is based on his own judgement and discretion in identifying the Ṣaḥābī; and that he forgot that it has been narrated from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah; since the majority have narrated it like that.

Ibn Ḥajar has stated in *Mukhtaṣar Zawā'id Musnad al-Bazzār* (1976):

Ash‘ath has erred; it is actually from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah.

As for the third path, I have not come across its chain but it is possible that this was an oversight since Ibn Rāhūyah — as previously quoted — has narrated

¹ What further supports it is that the majority of them narrate it from Ḥasan like that.

this narration and included it under the Musnad of Umm Salamah. However he narrates by way of Ḥasan, in a Mursal version. And Allah knows best.

All that remains is the first and last possibilities. The dominant view is the first path; for two reasons:

1. A large group has narrated it from Ḥasan as such and they are:

Isrāʾīl ibn Mūsā, Abū Mūsā al-Baṣrī; and he is one who has narrated from some of the great scholars fm the generation of the successors like Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Abū Ḥāzim al-Ashjaʿī and Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn. It has also been said the he narrates from Wahb ibn Munabbih, but this has been dismissed by al-Azdī and he said it is someone other than him. As for those who narrate from him, they are also from the giants of their era like Ibn ʿUyaynah, al-Qaṭṭān, and he is not one to narrate much. He is considered reliable according to the most accurate opinion since Ibn Maʿīn has ratified him, as has Abū Ḥātim who added, “no problem with him,” Ibn Ḥibbān has included him in *al-Thiqāṭ* and it is only al-Azdī who said of him, “there is some leniency in him.”

I say that no attention ought to be paid to what al-Azdī says especially when the majority of scholars have differed with him — as is the case here — and that is on account of his severity and harsh criteria. As for al-Azdī, some have spoken of him also.

What further shows the reliability of Isrāʾīl is the fact that al-Bukhārī accepts him as a narrator, and that al-Qaṭṭān narrates from him.

Mubārak ibn Faḍālah, there is some difference regarding him but the most correct opinion is that there is no problem with him.

Ashʿath ibn ʿAbd al-Malik al-Ḥumrānī, and they have differed with regards to him as well. Yahya ibn Maʿīn said:

Ḥafṣ ibn Ghiyāth left to ‘Abādān and the Baṣrīs gathered with him and said to him: “Do not narrate to us from any of these three; Ash‘ath ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd and Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad.” So he said, “As for Ash‘ath then his affair is with you and you decide with regards to him.”

Yaḥya al-Qaṭṭān has said: “According to me he is reliable and trustworthy.” Al-Bukhārī said: “Yaḥya ibn Sa‘īd and Bishr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal used to ratify Ash‘ath al-Ḥumrānī.” Aḥmad used to say:

He is more praiseworthy in narration than Ash‘ath ibn Sawwār, Shu‘bah narrates from him, and how pleased Yaḥya ibn Sa‘īd was of him. He was a well-versed with the rulings of Ḥasan. It was asked what Yūnus narrates and it would be said that he takes it from Ash‘ath ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.

Ibn Ma‘īn and al-Nasā‘ī said, “reliable”. Abū Zur‘ah said: “sound.” Abū Ḥātim said:

No problem with him and he is more reliable than al-Ḥaddādī and more correct than ibn Sawwār.”

Ibn ‘Adī said:

His narrations are generally above board and he is among those whose narrations may be recorded and relied on. He is from the bulk of those who are described with honesty and he is better than Ash‘ath ibn Sawwār by a great margin.

What supports him is that Shu‘bah and Ibn Qaṭṭān both narrate from him and this is the factor that tips the scale for me in considering him reliable. As for what Ibn Ma‘īn relates from Ḥafṣ ibn Ghiyāth, then that can be responded to in three ways:

- * Those Baṣrīs, we have no idea who they are. Are they from the great memorisers or are they from the general narrators?

- * What they say is not in conformity to what the senior memorisers have said; especially Yahya ibn Sa'īd who was the leading Baṣrī scholar of his era.
- * Their disinterest in him is not explicitly on account of his narrations. It is possible that there are other factors like the fact that he is from their region and his narrations are well known and they are seeking the narrations of others who were not from their region.

As for **Ash'ath**, well he is from the seniors from those who narrate from Ḥasan and ibn Sīrīn. Al-Qaṭṭān has stated the he has not come across anyone as thorough as him from those who narrate from Ḥasan. He is also known to have said that he does not know of anyone more precise in the narrations of Ḥasan than Ash'ath and that he has not met anyone after Ibn 'Awn more reliable in the narrations of Ibn Sīrīn than him. Aḥmad said: "He was very knowledgeable regarding the rulings of Ḥasan," and he mentioned of him that when he would go to Ḥasan, he [Ḥasan] would say to him, "ask your questions." And he used to say:

All that I narrate to you of Ḥasan is what I have heard from him except three narrations. The first is the narration of Ziyād al-A'lam — from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah that he did rukū' before joining the *ṣaff*[row]. The second is the narration of 'Uthmān al-Battī — from Ḥasan — from 'Alī on *al-Malāṣ*, and thirdly the narration of Ḥamzah al-Ḍabbī, from Ḥasan that a man asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about carrion.

Abū al-Ashhab, **Ja'far ibn Ḥayyān**, he is a reliable narrator and the group has narrated from him. His narration appears in al-Ṭabarānī – as has been mentioned – by way of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣadaqaḥ, from 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Yūsuf al-Jubayrī and 'Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf al-Jubayrī al-Baṣrī, from the children of Jubayr ibn Ḥayyah. Ibn Ḥibbān has included him in *al-Thiqāt* and said:

His son, Aḥmad, has narrated to us from him.

I say, that which supports him is the fact that a large number of the great scholars have narrated from him like Ibn Mājah, Ibn Khuzaymah, Ibn Abī Dāwūd, Abū ‘Arūbah, Ibn Ṣā‘id, Ḥarb ibn Ismā‘īl and others. What also indicates that he narrates in abundance is that he narrates from a large group; and a large group narrates from him and it is for that reason that Ibn Ḥajar has said of him in al-Taqrīb “trustworthy.” I say that it appears that if he is not on the higher level of “reliable” then he is “trustworthy”.

‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān, he is from the scholars but he is weak; although the chain to him is sound.

Ismā‘īl ibn Muslim, he is abandoned.

Then there are those who have heard from Ḥasan this narration but have not been named; as is in the narration of Ma‘mar.

2. The second reason is that this is an addition; and additions are acceptable from a reliable narrator since he who knows is a proof against one who does not. this addition has been narrated by a large group, as mentioned earlier, and among them are those who are highly reliable, those who are trustworthy, those who are merely fine, and those who have in them weakness.

Establishing That Ḥasan Heard From Abū Bakrah

There is a difference among the scholars regarding Ḥasan al-Baṣrī's hearing of ḥadīth from Abū Bakrah al-Thaqafī رضي الله عنه; and this difference consists of two views:

- » The first view is that he did not hear from him; and this is the opinion of Ibn Maʿīn, al-Dāraquṭnī¹ and others.
- » The second view is that he did indeed hear from him; and this is the view of Bahz ibn Asad al-ʿAmmī al-Baṣrī, ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī, al-Bukhārī, al-Bazzāz. It also appears to be the view of al-Tirmidhī since he authenticated two such narrations from Abū Bakrah.

Thereafter, those who accept his hearing from Abū Bakrah are further divided into two groups:

1. The first group considers it unrestricted direct narration;
2. The second group restricts it to some narrations and not all his narrations from Abū Bakrah.

The correct view is the second view due to the following reasons:

It appears in a number of narrations where Ḥasan expressly states that he heard

1 In *Suʾālāt al-Ḥākim* (320) he says: “Ḥasan did not hear from Abū Bakrah.” In *al-Tatabbuʾ* (323) he says: “Al-Bukhārī narrates aḥādīth from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah. Among them are the narration of *kusūf* [eclipse], ‘may Allah increase your determination; but do not repeat,’ ‘that nation who entrusts its affairs to a woman shall not prosper,’ and, ‘this son of mine is a sayyid,’ and Ḥasan does not narrate except from al-Aḥnaf, from Abū Bakrah.”

I say: I have only found one narration of his via al-Aḥnaf, based on what is in *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf* and *Ithāf al-Maharah* and Ḥasan is known for plenty of teachers to the extent that he even narrates from some of his students. So his hearing from al-Aḥnaf does not negate his hearing from Abū Bakrah.

from Abū Bakrah as is in the narration of Isrāʾīl ibn Mūsā al-Baṣrī, who is a reliable narrator, and this has been recorded by al-Bukhārī and others; and its referencing has previously been mentioned.

Also, the narration of Ziyād ibn Ḥassān al-Aʿlam al-Bāhilī al-Baṣrī; Aḥmad said of him, “*thiqah, thiqah* [reliable, reliable],” and Abū Ḥātim said, “he is from the senior companions of Ḥasan,” and his narration appears in the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd (683) – via the narration of Ibn Dāssah and al-Ramlī¹ – and al-Nasāʾī (2/118), both of them by way of Ḥumayd ibn Masʿadah – from Yazīd ibn Zurayʿ – from Saʿīd ibn Abī ʿArūbah – from Ziyād al-Aʿlam – from Ḥasan that Abū Bakrah narrated to him that he entered the Masjid while the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was in rukūʿ, so he went into rukūʿ before joining the row. So the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to him, “may Allah increase you in determination; but do not repeat [what you have just done].”

This has also been narrated by al-Bukhārī (783), by way of Mūsā ibn Ismāʿīl – from Hammām – from al-Aʿlam with the rest of the chain; however it does not state expressly that Ḥasan heard it from Abū Bakrah. Al-Shāfiʿī has said – as in *al-Maʿrifah* of al-Bayhaqī (2/381):

I have heard with a sound chain that Abū Bakrah told the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that he did rukūʿ before reaching the row; and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to him: “May Allah increase you in determination, but do not repeat.”

Also, the narration of Mubārak ibn Faḍālah al-Baṣrī² which appears in al-Bukhārī (1048) *Muʿallaq* [suspended – al-Bukhārī omits the chain] by way of Qutaybah –

1 Al-Bayhaqī narrates in his *Sunan* (3/106) by way of Ibn Dāssah, from Abū Dāwūd.

2 Even though Aḥmad said of him, “Mubārak ibn Faḍalah used to raise many narrations [to the Prophet ﷺ]; and he would say in many a narration, ‘from Ḥasan, from ʿImrān, from Ibn Mughaffal,’ but the other companions of Ḥasan did not say the same;” however, his narration gains support due to the other narrations.

who said — Ḥammād ibn Zayd narrated to us — who said — Yūnus narrated to us — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

Indeed the sun and the moon are two signs from the signs of Allah, they do not eclipse on account of the demise of anyone. However Allah instils fear into the hearts of His slaves through them.

Ash‘ath follows him up from Ḥasan; as does Mūsā, from Mubārak, from Ḥasan who said:

Abū Bakrah narrated to me that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:
“Indeed Allah uses them to instil fear into the hearts of His slaves.”

It was previously mentioned that he expressly stated hearing from Abū Bakrah, in the narration of Mubārak from him in the narration under analysis, “indeed this son of mine...” found in *Aḥmad* and *al-Bazzār*.

Aḥmad also narrates (5/41-42) that Abū al-Naḍr and ‘Affān both narrated to us – saying – al-Mubārak narrated to us — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah — ‘Affān said in his version: al-Mubārak narrated to us saying the he heard Ḥasan saying that Abū Bakrah narrated to him that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ came to a group of people who were exchanging unsheathed swords with each other and said:

May Allah curse those who have done this! Have I not prohibited against this?” then he said, “If any one of you draws his sword to look at it and wishes to hand it over to his brother; let him sheath it and then hand it over.”

Add to that the narration of Hishām ibn Hassān al-Baṣrī. Abū Bakr ibn Abī Khaythamah says — as in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (30/7) — Howdhah ibn Khalīfah narrated to us – who said – Hishām ibn Hassan narrated to us — from Ḥasan who said:

Anas ibn Mālik passed by me when Ziyād had sent him to Abū Bakrah to admonish him, so I went with him so we entered upon the shaykh and he was ill. So Anas conveyed the message on behalf of Ziyād: “Have I not appointed ‘Ubayd Allāh over Fāris? Have I not appointed Rawād over the treasury? Have I not appointed ‘Abd al-Raḥmān over the stipends and the bayt al-māl?” Abū Bakrah then said, “did he go on to say that he entered them into the Fire?” So Anas said, “I do not know him except to be a *Mujtahid* [exercising his better judgement],” so the shaykh said, “sit me up. Indeed I do not know him except to be a *Mujtahid*? What about the people of Ḥarūrā, they did ijtihād. Were they correct or did they err?” Ḥasan said, “we left having been defeated [in argument].”

This report is also narrated by Ṣāliḥ ibn Aḥmad in his *Masā’il* (1107) from his father, from Howdhah.

Secondly, this is the view of a large group of the scholars from Baṣrah. They were from the same city as Ḥasan so they would know him better than others. As for Abū Bakrah al-Thaqafī رضي الله عنه, he relocated to Baṣrah and passed away there. As was the case with Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as we will discuss later, with Allah’s permission. So their narrations are well known to the scholars of Baṣrah; and the narrations of Abū Bakrah and Ḥasan; and that which he did hear and that which he did not are best known to them. So, their opinion in this matter takes priority over others; taking their locality into consideration. I do not know of any of the scholars of Baṣrah — from the contemporaries of Ibn al-Madīnī and their likes — who have contradicted these Baṣran scholars in establishing that Ḥasan heard from Abū Bakrah. As for those who differ with them, they are not from Baṣrah.

Thirdly, Bahz ibn Asad al-Baṣrī is a student of many of the companions of Ḥasan. So he narrates from some of the companions of Ḥasan and he has opined that Ḥasan heard from Abū Bakrah some narrations. So his view has a unique feature above the rest since he is — on account of that — the most knowledgeable with regards to Ḥasan, when compared to others who have come after him. And this

forms one of the factors which gives dominance to the view that Ḥasan heard from Abū Bakrah.

Bahz ibn Asad is from the famous reliable narrators to the extent that Aḥmad said of him: “He is the pinnacle of accuracy.”

Fourthly, Ḥasan relocated to Baṣrah during the time of Şifḥīn and he remained there until his demise. Abū Bakrah relocated to Baṣrah, and passed away there in the year 51 A.H or 52 A.H, so this means that they lived in the same city for a period extending about 15 years. It is well-known that in those days there was only one Friday prayer and one ʿĪd prayer, so that, in addition to what has preceded, supports the view that Ḥasan heard from Abū Bakrah.

Fifthly, Ḥasan basis some of his views on the narrations which he narrates from Abū Bakrah; and his using them as evidence is an indication of their authenticity according to him. From these is his acceptance of the narration under analysis:

Aḥmad narrates (5/44) from Hishām — who narrated from Mubārak — who narrated from Ḥasan — who said - Abū Bakrah narrated to us that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was praying with the people and Ḥasan رضي الله عنه was climbing on his back whenever he prostrated, and this continued. So the people told him, “by Allah we have seen you do with this — little one — something we have never seen you do with anyone.” Mubārak said that he mentioned something — then said, “indeed this son of mine is a sayyid; and Allah will bring about reconciliation through him between two great parties from the Muslims.” Ḥasan said, “by Allah, I swear again by Allah, that after he became the leader no blood was spilt, even to the extent that would fill a cup used for cupping.

Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah says in his *Musnad* (4/131), ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Maḥdī narrated to us — who said — Sahl ibn Abī al-Şalt narrated to us saying that he heard Ḥasan saying that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

Indeed this son of mine is a sayyid; Allah will reconcile through him

between two parties from the Muslims,” meaning Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī. Ḥasan [al-Baṣrī] said: “By Allah, I have witnessed that. Allah had reconciled, through him, between two parties from the Muslims.”

And from that, as well, is what Abū Dāwūd narrates in his *Sunan* (1242), ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Mu‘ādh narrated to us – who said – my father narrated to us from Ash‘ath – from Ḥasan – from Abū Bakrah who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ prayed Ṣuḥr prayer as a prayer of fear, so some of them formed rows behind him and the others faced the enemy. So he performed two rak‘ahs and then did salām. So those who prayed got up and stood in the position of their companions and they came to pray behind the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; so he prayed two rak‘ahs with them and then did salām. So, it was four rak‘ahs for him and for them two rak‘ahs each; and this was the opinion of Ḥasan.¹

Sixthly, the narration of Ḥasan from Abū Bakrah is sound and there is nothing objectionable in it. And he has been partly corroborated in what he narrates from Abū Bakrah.

There appears in certain versions of his narrations, some wordings which might appear to be uncorroborated, but can be reconciled through explanation:

The First Narration

Aḥmad narrates (5/41) from Yazīd – who said - Ḥammād ibn Salamah narrated to us from Ziyād al-A‘lam – from Ḥasan – from Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ began the prayer and said the takbīr, then gestured with his hand for them to remain in their places, then he entered [his home] and exited whilst his head was dripping. He performed the prayer and after completion, he said:

I am but a man; and I was Junub.

1 This statement seems to be from the comments of Ash‘ath as will appear from what has been related by *al-Bayhaqī*.

Aḥmad narrates it (5/41) from Abū Kāmil, with the same chain to Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ began the prayer of Fajr and then indicated with his hand...

He also narrates it (5/45) from ‘Affān with the same chain to Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ began the prayer of Fajr and then indicated with his hand to his companions...

Abū Dāwūd narrates this ḥadīth (236) by way of Mūsā ibn Ismā‘īl and Yazīd; as does Ibn Khuzaymah (1629) by way of ‘Affān, Yaḥya ibn ‘Abbād and Yazīd, all of them from Ḥammād ibn Salamah with the rest of the chain.

This narration is authentic except that the statement, “he did takbīr, then gestured,” this seems to be contrary to what has been narrated in the two *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections by way of al-Zuhrī, from Abū Salamah, from Abū Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ exited [his home] and the iqāmah was called out, the rows straightened and when he stood at his position we waited for him to do takbīr; he left saying, “remain in your positions,” and we remained where we were until he exited again; his head dripping with water after ghusl.

In the version of Muslim it appears:

So the Messenger of Allah ﷺ arrived, and when he stood at his spot, before he could do takbīr, he remembered so he left and said to us, “remain in your places.”

This can be responded to in two ways. The first method of responding is from the perspective of transmission; and that is that the narrations have variations and there are narrations that also support the version of the ḥadīth of Abū Bakrah.

Aḥmad (1/88) narrates from Ibn Lahī‘ah, with his chain to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib:

Whilst we were with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ praying, he left whilst

we were standing and when he returned water was dripping from his head...

Aḥmad (2/448) narrates from Wakī, with his chain to Abū Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ exited his home for prayer; and when he did the takbīr he left and gestured for them to remain as they were. He went to perform ghusl and when he returned water was dripping from his head and he led the prayer...

This has also been narrated by Ibn Mājah (1210).

Al-Ṭaḥāwī in *Mushkil al-Āthār* (3/88) and al-Dāraquṭnī (1/362) narrate by way of ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Mu‘ādh al-‘Anbarī — from his father — from Sa‘īd — from Qatādah — from Anas who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ entered the prayer and did takbīr, and we did takbīr after him; then he indicated to the people to remain as they were and we remained standing until he returned after having performed ghusl, and the water was dripping from his head.

Al-Dāraquṭnī said after it, “‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Khaffāf has contradicted him,” then he narrated it by way of ‘Abd al-Wahhāb — from Sa‘īd — from Qatādah — from Bakr ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Muzanī; Mursal. Thereafter he said, “‘Abd al-Wahhāb said, ‘and we accept this.’”

Mālik has narrated in him *Muwatṭā* (1/48) from Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Ḥakīm, that ‘Aṭā’ ibn Yasār told him that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did takbīr in one of his prayers, then indicated to them with his hand to remain, then went; and when he returned the effects of water could be seen on his skin.

Abū Dāwūd said in his *Sunan* (1/263), Ayyūb, ibn ‘Awn, and Hishām have all narrated it from Muhammad [ibn Sīrīn] — from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that he did takbīr, then indicated for them to sit and he went to perform ghusl.

Likewise it was been narrated by Mālik — from Ismāʿīl ibn Abī Ḥakīm — from ‘Aṭā’ ibn Yasār — from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Abū Dāwūd says further:

Likewise, Muslim ibn Ibrāhīm has narrated to us — from Abān — from Yahya — from al-Rabīʿ ibn Muḥammad — from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that he did takbīr.

The second approach is interpretative and has two methods:

- a. The first method is one of considering it to be more than one incident; this was the method of Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Nawawī.
- b. The second method is to resolve the superficial contradiction through a plausible explanation and that is the intended meaning by, “entered the prayer” and “did the takbīr” meant that it was very close to beginning the prayer; and al-Ṭahāwī is from those who preferred this method.

And with this, the problematic statement is resolved — even if there is a slight inaccuracy since what is in the two *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections is more accurate; it is very close.

The Second Narration

Al-Nasāʾī narrates in *al-Ṣughhrā* (3/152) — from ‘Amr ibn ‘Alī — from Yazīd [ibn Zurayʿ] — from Yūnus — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah who said:

We were with the Prophet ﷺ when the sun eclipsed so he hastened to the Masjid, dragging his shawl. The people gathered with him and he prayed two rakʿahs with them. When the sun emerged again he delivered a sermon saying, “the sun and moon are two signs...”

This has also been narrated by al-Bazzār (3662), Ibn Khuzaymah (1374), al-Ṭahāwī (1/330), al-Baghawī in *al-Jaʿdiyyāt* (1385), al-Bayhaqī (3/331) and others, all of them by way of Yazīd ibn Zurayʿ with the same chain.

Ismā'īl ibn 'Ulayyah has also narrated it

Ibn Ḥibbān narrates (2853) from Abū Ya'lā — from Abū Khaythamah — from Ismā'īl ibn Ibrāhīm — from Yūnus — from 'Ubayd — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah saying:

We were with the Prophet ﷺ when the sun eclipsed. He stood up and made his way to the Masjid hastily, dragging his lower garment, or his shawl, and the people followed him. He prayed with them two rak'ahs as you pray...

Al-Baghawī also narrates the version of Ismā'īl jointly, with the narration of Yazīd ibn Zuray' (1385).

Ash'ath ibn 'Abd al-Malik narrates it as well as mentioned by al-Nasā'ī (1492) by way of Ismā'īl bn Mas'ūd — from Khālīd — from him; as does Ibn Ḥibbān (2837) by way of Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Tājir — from 'Abd al-Karīm ibn 'Abd Allāh — from al-Naḍr ibn Shumayl, from Ash'ath with the same chain; and it is narrated by al-Ḥākim (1/334) by way of Aḥmad ibn Ya'qūb, from Yūsuf ibn Ya'qūb, from Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, from Khālīd ibn al-Ḥārith, from him with the same chain. Al-Bayhaqī narrates it from al-Ḥākim (3/337-338).

Al-Nasā'ī also narrates it (1464) by way of 'Amr ibn 'Alī and Muḥammad ibn al-'Abd al-A'lā — from Khālīd — from Ash'ath — without this statement.

Al-Bukhārī mentions the narration of Ash'ath as Mu'allaq (1048) without mentioning this statement.

Al-Baghawī narrates in *al-Ja'diyyāt* (1384) from Zayd ibn Akhzam and 'Alī ibn Muslim both narrated to us — saying — Sa'd ibn 'Āmir narrated to us — who said — Shu'bah narrated to us from Yūnus ibn 'Ubayd — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah who said:

The sun eclipsed during the time of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and he prayed two rak'ahs — this is the version of 'Alī ibn Muslim.

In the version of Zayd ibn Akhzam it goes: “The Prophet ﷺ led us in prayer during the eclipse, the same as our regular prayer...” without mentioning the two rak'ahs; and this narration it was said of it that none narrated it from Shu'bah besides Sa'īd ibn 'Āmir.

The statement in this narration, “... and he prayed two rak'ahs as you usually pray,” it could be understood to mean that the prayer at the time of eclipse has only one rukū'; and this contradicts the authentic narrations in describing the prayer at the time of eclipse.

This can be responded to through two approaches as well:

The first is on the basis of transmission; and that is Ibn 'Ulayyah, Yazīd ibn Zuray' and Ash'ath have all been contradicted. It has been narrated by Khālīd al-Wāsiṭī, 'Abd al-Wārith ibn Sa'īd, 'Abd al-A'lā, Shu'bah — in the other version of this narration narrated by Sa'īd ibn 'Āmir — Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Ḥammād ibn Salamah, Hushaym ibn Bashīr, Nūḥ ibn Qays, all of them from Yūnus ibn 'Ubayd without mentioning this statement.

1. The narration of Khālīd al-Wāsiṭī is in *al-Bukhārī* (1040).
2. The narration of 'Abd al-Wārith ibn Sa'īd is also in *al-Bukhārī* (1063).
3. The narration of 'Abd al-A'lā al-Sāmī is also in *al-Bukhārī* (5785).
4. The narration of Ḥammād ibn Zayd is in *al-Bukhārī* (1048) and *al-Nasā'ī* (1459).
5. The narration of Hushaym is in *al-Nasā'ī* (1463) and *al-Ṭaḥāwī* (3/330).
6. The narration of Ḥammād ibn Salamah is in *al-Bayhaqī* (3/337).
7. The narration of Nūḥ ibn Qays is in *Ibn Ḥibbān* (2833 as in *al-Iḥsān*).

8. The narration of Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir, from Shuʿbah in *al-Bukhārī* (1062) via Maḥmūd [ibn Ghaylān].

9. Yaḥya ibn Sakan also narrates from Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir, from Shuʿbah — as in *al-Jaʿdiyyāt* (1386), by way of ʿAmr al-Nāqid.

As for the narration of Zayd ibn Akhzam, from Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir, from Shuʿbah it appears to be an error from Zayd — if the narration from him is correct¹ — for two reasons:

- » Firstly, ʿAlī ibn Muslim, Maḥmūd ibn Ghaylān and ibn Marzūq — whose narration is in *Sharḥ Maʿānī al-Āthār* (1/330) of al-Ṭaḥāwī and *al-Kubrā* of al-Bayhaqī (3/331) — have all contradicted him and they have not mentioned this statement.
- » Secondly, a large number of scholars have narrated it from Shuʿbah without mentioning this statement.

The second approach in response is on the basis of interpretation. Ibn Ḥibbān (2835 as in *al-Iḥsān*) said:

The statement of Abū Bakrah, “he prayer two rakʿahs as you usually pray...” what is meant by it is how you usually pray when it eclipses, i.e. four rukūʿ and sujūd in two rakʿahs.

And this is a plausible response. And Allah knows best.

The Third Narration

Aḥmad (5/46) narrates from ʿAbd al-Razzāq — who said — Maʿmar narrated to us from Qatādah and many others — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Verily the fragrance of

1 *Al-Bazzār* (3660) narrates it from Zayd ibn Akhzam — from Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir, but does not include this statement. And Allah knows best.

Jannah can be found from a distance of one hundred years [journey]; and no slave [of Allah] kills a person who was granted protection except that Allah will deprive him of Jannah and its fragrance.” Abū Bakrah said: “May Allah make my ears go deaf if I had not heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying that.”

This, on its apparent meaning, appears to be at odds with what is found in *al-Bukhārī* (3166) by way of Mujāhid — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

Whoever kills someone who has been granted protection shall not get the fragrance of Jannah; and its fragrance can be found from a distance of forty years.

This is also responded to from two perspectives:

- » Firstly, this particular chain has been described by some of the senior scholars as being flawed. Al-Bukhārī mentions this narration in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (1/428) from Sufyān — from Yūnus — from al-Ḥakam ibn al-A‘raj — from Ash‘ath and then says:

And Ḥammād said from Yūnus — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah. However, the first one is more correct.

Al-Nasā‘ī said in *al-Kubrā* (8744) — after narrating it from Ḥammād — from Yūnus — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah:

This is a mistake. And the correct narration is from Ibn ‘Ulayyah; and Ibn ‘Ulayyah is more reliable than Ḥammād ibn Salamah.

The narration of Ibn ‘Ulayyah is in *al-Nasā‘ī* (4748) and *Aḥmad* (5/38) from Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd — from al-Ḥakam ibn al-A‘raj — from Ash‘ath ibn Tharmalah — from Abū Bakrah who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Whoever kills a person who has been granted protection without rightful cause; Allah shall deprive him of the fragrance Jannah.”

- » The second approach is based on interpretation and that is assuming the correctness of the narration, yet reconciling the superficial contradiction. The mention of a lesser amount does not negate the greater amount. There are numerous example of this in the Sunnah.

Ibn al-Qayyim states in *Ḥādī al-Arwāḥ* (119-120) — after pointing out the variances in the narrations that describe the distance from which the fragrance of Jannah is perceived:

There is no contradiction between these statements. They [al-Bukhārī and Muslim] have both narrated from Anas who said: “My uncle was not present with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ at Badr and that bothered him and he used to say, ‘...the first battle of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and I was not present with him? If Allah grants me repite to witness another encounter alongside the Messenger of Allah ﷺ I will show Allah what I am prepared to do.’ He was present on the Day of Uḥud with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and he met Sa’d ibn Mu’ādh, who asked him: ‘Where to?’ and he replied, ‘how wonderful is the fragrance of Jannah! I find it coming from Uḥud!’ so he fought until he was martyred and his body had sustained over eighty wounds, slashes and stabs. His sister, the aunt of al-Rabī ibn al-Naḍr said, ‘I did not recognise my brother except by the tips of his fingers; and it was on this that the verse was revealed: ‘From among the believers are men who have fulfilled their covenant with Allah...’” they considered it to have been revealed regarding him and his companions.

The fragrance of Jannah is of two kinds. One kind of fragrance can be perceived by the souls of some of the slaves of Allah in this world and others cannot perceive it. The other is the fragrance that is perceived by

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 23

the senses of the body just as one smells fragrant flowers etc. So this type of fragrance the inmates of Jannah all perceive it in the next life, from a distance and from close-up; as for this world then only the selected ones from the Prophets and Messengers, and it is this type of fragrance that Anas ibn al-Naḍr possibly perceived. And Allah knows best.

The Fourth Narration

Ibn Khuzaymah narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (1368) from Muḥammad ibn Ma'mar ibn Ribī al-Qaysī – who said – 'Amr ibn Khalīfah al-Bakrāwī narrated to us – who said – Ash'ath narrated to us from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ prayed Maghrib with the people, three rak'ahs then left. Another group came and he prayed with them three rak'ahs. So the prayer of the Prophet ﷺ was six rak'ahs and the people prayed three rak'ahs each.

Al-Ḥākim narrates it in *al-Mustadrak* (1/337) by way of Muḥammad ibn Ma'mar with the same chain. He said at the end of it:

I heard Abū 'Alī al-Ḥāfiẓ saying: “This ḥadīth is Gharīb; Ash'ath al-Ḥumrānī did not record it except with this chain.”

A large group of narrators have narrated this from Ash'ath and they have narrated contrary to what 'Amr ibn Khalīfah narrates; among them is Mu'adh ibn Mu'adh, Sa'īd ibn 'Āmir, Abū 'Āṣim and Abū Ḥurrah.

Abū Dāwūd narrates (1242) from 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Mu'adh – who said – my father narrated to me from Ash'ath — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ prayed Ṣuḥr at a time of fear and some of them formed a row behind him and the others faced the enemy. He prayed two rak'ahs, then made salām; and those who prayed with him left and stood in the position of their companions and those came to pray behind him. He prayed two rak'ahs with them and then did salām; so the

Messenger of Allah ﷺ prayed four and his companions prayed two each. And Ḥasan used to give a verdict on this. Abū Dāwūd said: “Likewise in Maghrib, the Imām shall pray six and the people three each.”

Al-Bayhaqī said in his *Sunan* (3/259-260) — after narrating it via Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir — from Ashʿath — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah رضى الله عنه that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ prayed with some of them two rakʿahs, then made salām. They went back and the others joined the prayer and he prayed two rakʿahs and then made salām; so it was four for the Prophet ﷺ, and two for the Muslims in the prayer during fear. Al-Bayhaqī said:

That is how it has been narrated by Muʿādh ibn Muʿādh — from Ashʿath and he said, “in Ṣuḥr” and he added, “that is what Ḥasan used to give verdict on. Likewise for Maghrib, the Imām will have six and the people three each.”

Abū ʿAlī al-Rūḍhabārī has narrated it to us from Abū Bakr ibn Dāssah — who said — Abū Dāwūd narrated to us from ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Muʿādh — who said — my father narrated to us from Ashʿath and he mentioned the narration with its meaning but a variant wording and mentioned this addition. As for the statement, “likewise in Maghrib,” I have found it in my book connected to the ḥadīth but it seems to be the statement of Ashʿath; and it appears in some copies: Abū Dāwūd said: “Likewise in Maghrib.” Some people have narrated it from Ashʿath, a Marfūʿ version. However, I consider it to be nothing but a lapse of concentration in this case.

He said in *al-Maʿrifah* (3/17):

ʿAmr ibn Khalīfah narrates it from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah — from the Prophet ﷺ regarding Maghrib, but it is an oversight. The correct version is the first one [i.e. that it was in Ṣuḥr], and Allah knows best.

Al-Ṭaḥāwī says in *Sharḥ Maʿānī al-Āthār* (1/315):

Abū Bakrah and Ibn Marzūq narrate to us – saying – Abū ʿĀṣim narrated

to us from Ash‘ath, from Ḥasan, from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم prayed the prayer of fear with them and he prayed two rak‘ahs with a group of them; then they went and the others came and he prayed with them two rak‘ahs. So the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم prayed four; and each group prayed two. Abū Bakrah narrated to us — saying Abū Dāwūd narrated to us — saying Abū Ḥurrah narrated to us from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah — from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, a similar narration.

Commenting on the Authenticity of This Ḥadīth

It has been previously established that there is no doubt in the authenticity of the narration up to Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. What has also been previously established is that the preferred view, in light of as the variant versions of this narration, is the version of the narration of those who narrate it from him — from Abū Bakrah. In addition to this it has been proven that the most accurate view is that Ḥasan heard from Abū Bakrah. Therefore, the preferred view would be the authenticity of this narration; and the senior scholars have authenticated this ḥadīth as we will come to see in the sections that follow.

Dealing With the Corroboratory Narrations

This narration has both general and specific corroborations. As for the specific corroborations they will come later; and the general corroborations will be mentioned first.

Firstly, the texts of Noble Qur'ān and prophetic Sunnah indicate the virtue of reconciliation, and encourage it. Allah says:

There is no good in much of their private counsel except one who encourages charity, or [doing] what is right, or reconciliation among people...”¹

He also says:

and reconciliation is better...²

and

Fear Allah and set things right among yourselves...³

and

If two parties from the believers fight each other, reconcile between them...⁴

and

Verily the believers are but brothers; so reconcile between your brothers...⁵

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 114

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 128

3 Sūrah Anfāl: 1

4 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9

5 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 10

In both *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections it is narrated from Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

Every bone of the body has a charity upon it; upon the rising of the sun.
Observing justice between two people is a charity...

It is narrated in both collections as well, from Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Uqbah who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying: “He is not a liar; who makes peace between people by inventing good information or saying good things.”

Secondly, the actual occurrence of this narration testifies to the authenticity of the ḥadīth; and reference was made to it from the statement of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī when he cited this narration as proof for the reconciliation between Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه.

Thirdly, Ḥasan رضي الله عنه was given the pledge by the people of Iraq and a huge contingent from the believers were with him, but despite that he abdicated in favour of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and that for a number of reasons which possibly include this ḥadīth, and Allah knows best.

Dealing With the Narrations That Corroborate This Ḥadīth Specifically

The Narration of Jābir

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī narrates in his *Tārīkh* (8/26-27) with his chain to Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn – who said – Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī narrated to us from al-Aʿmash – from Abū Sufyān – from Jābir who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said with regards to Ḥasan:

Verily this son of mine is a sayyid; Allah will reconcile between two parties of the Muslims through him.

The narrators of this narration are all reliable and well-known and the scholars have narrated from all of them [from Ibn Maʿīn]. Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī, the most accurate opinion regarding him is that he is trustworthy, fine in ḥadīth. The majority ratify him, like Ibn Maʿīn – in most of the reports from him – and Ibn ʿAmmār, al-Dāraquṭnī, and Ibn Saʿd. Abū Dāwūd has said of him: “No problem with him, reliable.” However, Aḥmad has said: “He has not had much movement in [seeking] ḥadīth.” In another narration he said:

I do not think he had much ḥadīth but they claim that he has many narrations from al-Aʿmash and others; and we have written from him. He had a brother, who had status and knowledge, called ʿAbd Allāh. Yaḥya’s opinion on him was not clear it appears that he said, “he was truthful but not a person of ḥadīth.”

I say that these statements indicate that he narrated a fair amount from al-Aʿmash; however he was not very precise and accurate. Rather he was slightly shy of that [level] and it is with this that one can respond to the objections of al-ʿUqaylī in *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ*. Al-Bukhārī has recorded of his, four narrations, two of which have alternate chains in *al-Bukhārī*, one of them from al-Aʿmash; and the other two have alternate chains in *Muslim*. Ibn Ḥajar described him as “al-Ḥāfiẓ,” and

al-Dhahabī included him in *Tadhkirat al-Huffāz*.

I say that this description of memory is supplementary to what Aḥmad said of him that he was famous for narrations in Maghāzī. As for what Ibn Saʿd has regarding him being one of few ḥadīth but reliable, is not completely accurate; taking into account all that has been mentioned previously.

Further, I say that al-Dhahabī has said of him in *al-Tadhkirah* that a large number have narrated from him.

As for the remainder of the narrators in the chain, they are well-known. Abū Sufyān and his having heard from Jābir; there is much said regarding that and the summary of it all is that he heard some of the narrations, whilst he had gotten some of them from his scroll. This scroll was known as the scroll of Jābir and is very famous. It has been established from him that he said:

I had resided in Makkah with Jābir for six months.

His narrations are in both *Ṣaḥīḥ* collections; however the narrations in *al-Bukhārī* are all supplementary [Mutābaʿāt]¹.

The narration of al-Aʿmash from him is famous, to the extent that he is described as being the main narrator from him, and Ibn ʿAdī has said:

No problem with him, al-Aʿmash has narrated from him sound narrations.

I say: Yaḥya ibn Saʿid has been supported by the narration of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Maghrāʾ, al-Ṭabarānī narrates in *al-Kabīr* (3/35) with his chain to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Maghrāʾ — from al-Aʿmash — from Abū Sufyān — from Jābir who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Verily this son of mine — meaning Ḥasan — is a noble; and Allah will certainly bring about reconciliation

1 I have discussed this at length in the commentary of *al-Tirmidhī* (275).

through him, between two parties from the Muslims.

Al-Bazzār has also narrated it — as in *Kashf al-Astār* (2635) — by way of Yūsuf ibn Mūsā — from Ibn Maghrā' with this chain. Al-Bazzār said:

We do not know it being narrated from Jābir except by this chain.

I say that 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Maghrā', there is a difference regarding him. And they have singled out his narration from al-A'mash. Ibn al-Madīnī said:

Nothing; he used to narrate from al-A'mash six hundred narrations which we have abandoned. He was not all that.

Ibn 'Adī said:

It is as 'Ali said. I have only criticised Abū Zuhayr on account of these narrations from al-A'mash; which are not supported by the narrations of the reliable narrators.

So this narration does not lend strength to the narration of Yaḥya ibn Sa'īd for the reasons above.

The summary is that this chain from Yaḥya ibn Sa'īd is strong for the aforementioned reasons, but it is Gharīb; and the solitary narrations of Yaḥya are not sufficient; but they are fine for lending support. So the practise is on the narration of Abū Bakrah, and the narration of Jābir serves only a supplementary capacity.

Al-Bazzār said in his *Musnad* (9/110-111):

This narration is narrated from Jābir and Abū Bakrah. However, the narration of Abū Bakrah is better known and has a better chain; whereas the narration Jābir is rare.

Al-Ṭabarānī, in *al-Awsaṭ* (1810), said:

No one narrates this ḥadīth from al-Aʿmash except ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, and Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd al-Umawī.

The Narration of Anas

Abū ʿAmr al-Dānī says in *al-Fitan* (1/216-217):

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Farāʾidī narrated to us — by our reading to him — ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn Nuṣayr narrated to us — who said — Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Farrūkh narrated to us — in al-Rāfiqah — saying — ʿUmar ibn Muḥammad al-Asdī [known better as Ibn al-Tallī] narrated to us from his father — who narrated from Maʿqil ibn Abān — from Anas that the Prophet ﷺ said to Ḥasan: “This son of mine is a sayyid; Allah will reconcile at his hands between two groups from my ummah, he will spare their blood through it.”

I say that this chain has in it Abān al-Raqqāshī. He was from the people of piety; but he is abandoned. There is a difference regarding him whether he deliberately related false narrations or not?

Shuʿbah described him with dishonesty; whereas the others have differed and said that he did not do so deliberately. It occurred to him on account of his negligence and poor memory. Abū Ḥātim said:

Abandoned in ḥadīth, he was a righteous person however he was afflicted with a poor memory.

Abū Zurʿah was asked, “did he intentionally lie?” and he replied, “no. He would hear the narrations of Anas, Shahr, and from Ḥasan but did not distinguish between them.”

It appears that there was much carelessness in him. Yazīd ibn Zuray‘ said:

He narrated a narration to me from Anas so I said to him, “from the Prophet ﷺ?” and he replied, “does Anas relate from anyone other than the Prophet ﷺ?” so I abandoned him.

And this chain – even though it holds little value as has been mentioned — indicates the popularity of this narration. And Allah knows best.

Regarding Those Scholars Who Have Authenticated This Narration

A large group of the scholars have authenticated, and considered strong, this narration. Among them:

1. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī as it has previously appeared that he used this narration as proof, which is an indication of its strength according to him.
2. Ibn ‘Uyaynah, it has been previously mentioned of him that he said: “The statement, “... two groups from the Muslims” impresses us greatly.”
3. Ibn al-Madīnī
4. Al-Bukhārī
5. Al-Tirmidhī
6. Ibn Ḥibbān
7. Al-Baghawī, as in *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* (14/136)

And many others besides them who have expressly pointed out the authenticity of this ḥadīth.

And with Allah is prosperity; and may the saluation and mercy of Allah be upon our Prophet, Muḥammad, and his companions and followers.¹

Signed

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sa’d

1 I would like to thank my dear ‘sons’ ‘Abd al-Majīd ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wuḥaybī, Ayman ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Ulayyān and Sāmī ibn Muḥammad ibn Jād Allāh; for assisting me in collecting the academic material for this research. May Allah reward them abundantly

Authors Preface

All praise is due to Allah who has prepared for every era — after the interval of succession of Messengers — a few who remain from the people of [Islamic] learning who call those who have strayed, towards guidance; and who remain patient against trouble and harm. Who bring life to the deceased through the Book of Allah; and who make those who are blind see, by the Light of Allah. How many a victim of assassination by Iblis have they restored life to! And, how many a misguided, stray person have they given guidance to! So, how wonderful is their effect on mankind! And, how distasteful is the effects of mankind upon them! They dispel from the Book of Allah the distortion of the radicals, the plagiarism of the people of falsehood, and the misinterpretation of the people of ignorance; those who have hoisted the flags of innovation, who have set loose the clouds of fitnah. For indeed they are divided regarded the Book. They speak regarding Allah and His Book without any [sound] knowledge. They discuss the complex issues of doctrine and dupe the unsuspecting, uneducated people, thus confusing them. So we seek refuge in Allah from the trials of the ones who mislead.

I bear testimony that there is none worthy of worship besides Allah, alone, without any partner in His Divine, nor in His right to be worshipped, nor in His Names and Attributes. I also bear testimony that Muḥammad ﷺ is His slave, and His chosen Messenger, and selected Prophet. May the salutations and blessings of Allah be conferred upon him, and upon his family and companions, and upon those who follow them with excellence, until the Day of Reckoning.

How wonderful it is what Imām Aḥmad¹ رحمه الله said in regard to those who collect the narrations and reports that seek to defame the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of

1 Abū 'Abd Allāh, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241 A.H/ 855 CE)

Allah ﷺ. He has said, as reported in *Kitāb al-Sunnah* by al-Khallāl¹:

If this was said about people whose ancestry is unknown I would have reproached it, how then if it is the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ?! ... I have not recorded these narrations!”². Al-Marrūdhī³ رحمه الله said: “I said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh, ‘so, if I know anyone who writes these foul narrations and collect them; is he to be renounced?’ He said, ‘yes, the people of such narrations deserve to be stoned!’⁴

You will be overcome by shock and struck by amazement when you see what some writers, from those who purport investigative academic research and the liberation of Islamic history from distortion and interpolation; the audacity they display in maligning the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger ﷺ and the early generation of Muslims, defaming the Ṣaḥābah and mocking them; by limiting the status of companionship to the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār, and excluding the thousands who embraced Islam after the incident of Ḥudaybiyyah and the Conquest of Makkah from the status of companionship in terms of its definition in the sharī‘ah. Thereby, insinuating that the texts that have come in praise of the Ṣaḥābah do not extend to these individuals; in addition to defaming their moral integrity. So they are only companions in the lexical application of the word.

This is a newly invented view that has been introduced into the religion for which there is no precedent. It goes to the extent that the *Rāfiḍah* [Twelver Shī‘ah] who declare apostasy and disbelief upon the Ṣaḥābah رحمه الله, with the exception of a few individuals among them [who did not renegade on their faith, according to them], yet they do not deny their companionship. However — all praise be to Allah, it is His Favour — their capacity to perform righteous deeds has come to an

1 Abū Bakr, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Khallāl (d. 311 A.H / 923 CE)

2 *Kitāb al-Sunnah* (3/501)

3 Abū Bakr, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥajjāj al-Marrūdhī (d. 275 A.H / 888 CE)

4 Its chain is authentic. For further reference see *Kitāb al-İbānah* by Ibn Baṭṭāh (pg. 294) and *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* by al-Dhahabī (10/92).

end, yet Allah wills that their rewards continue to increase.¹

Not to mention the vilification of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. On the other hand having praise for the people of innovation and vain-desire and their invented practices. Furthermore, describing the books of the early generation as being books of anthropomorphism and criticising the books of Islamic doctrine. Besides that, there are other aspects which shall not be mentioned from these innovations and deviated practices that were not spelt out clearly at first, but their gradual progression towards deviance.

It is well known that the symbol of the people of vain-desire and innovation is their maligning of the Muslims of the earliest generation and the people of ḥadīth; and designating titles to the Ahl al-Sunnah by descriptions that they are innocent of; very much similar to a famous idiom, *a pot calling a kettle black*. Abū Zur'ah² رحمه الله and Abū Ḥātim³ رحمه الله have both said: “The symbol of people of innovation is defaming the people of *athar* [ḥadīth]”⁴. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī رحمه الله said: “The symbol of people of innovation is defaming the people of *athar*, the sign of the heretics is referring the people of *athar* as Ḥashwiyyah, and the sign of the Qadariyyah is referring to the people of *athar* as Mujabbirah, and the sign of the

1 Ibn Taymiyyah — Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ḥalīm — (d. 728 A.H / 1328 CE) has written in *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl*:

As for those who go beyond that by claiming that they turned apostates after the Messenger ﷺ except for a few individuals whose number does not exceed twenty, or that they became transgressors collectively, for such a person as well there is no doubt in his disbelief since he is negating that which has been unequivocally statement in numerous places in the Qur'ān in terms of [Divine] Pleasure being on them [the Ṣaḥābah] and their praises being mentioned. In fact, one who doubts the disbelief of such a person, then his disbelief [the one who doubts] has also been realised.

2 Abū Zur'ah, 'Ubayd Allāh ibn 'Abd al- Karīm al-Rāzī (d. 264 A.H / 878 CE)

3 Abū Ḥātim, Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Rāzī (d. 277 A.H / 890 CE)

4 Narrated by al-Lālaka'ī — Abū al-Qāsim, Hibat Allāh ibn Ḥasan (d. 418 A.H/ 1027 CE) — in his book *Sharḥ Usūl i'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (1/179)

Jahmiyyah is referring to the people of athar as Mushabbihah.”¹

Al-Sābūnī رحمہ اللہ said:

All of that is due to partisan prejudice and the people of Sunnah deserve no name except one and that is the people of ḥadīth [tradition]³.

Al-Lālakā'ī رحمہ اللہ has narrated⁴ from Maymūn ibn Mihrān رحمہ اللہ who said:

Ibn ‘Abbās رحمہ اللہ said to me: “O Maymūn, do not curse the early generation of Muslims and enter into paradise peacefully.”⁵

Many books have been written in refutation of these doubts and fabrications, and many of the people of [Islamic] learning and students of [Islamic] knowledge have been up in arms, with the aim of exposing these fabrications and propaganda, May Allah reward them all.

This book will be – with the Will of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى — a response to the confusion and fabrications that have been mentioned with regards to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رحمہ اللہ, since tens of pages have been blackened [with ink] with defamatory remarks and unsubstantiated criticism against him, which include:

- * Mu‘āwiyah initiated the practice of cursing ‘Alī ibn Abī Tālib رحمہ اللہ from the pulpits.
- * He traded in alcohol and intoxicants.
- * He concluded transactions based on interest.
- * He sold idols to the people of India.

1 See *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* by al-Barbahārī (pg. 109)

2 Abū ‘Uthmān, Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sābūnī (d. 449 A.H / 1058 CE)

3 al-Sābūnī, ‘*Aqīdat al-Salaf wa Ashāb al-Ḥadīth* (pg. 305)

4 *Sharḥ Usūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (7/1325)

5 Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (61/249), al-Mizzī in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (29/217)

- * He murdered 25 of the participants of Badr on the Day of Šifffin.
- * Mu'āwiyah was the first to change the prophetic Sunnah.
- * Mu'āwiyah was pleased with the murder of 'Ammār, and fought against him and had his corpse burnt.
- * Establishing that Mu'āwiyah was cursed by the Messenger ﷺ through narrations with sound chains.
- * The accusation of Seniors from the participants of Badr – like 'Ubādah ibn Šāmit رضى الله عنه – that he was from the leaders of evil.
- * The accusation of 'Ammār ibn Yāsir رضى الله عنه regarding the belief of Mu'āwiyah and his ['Ammār's] doubts regarding his [Mu'āwiyah's] Islam.
- * The accusation of 'Ammār ibn Yāsir رضى الله عنه that Mu'āwiyah was from the hypocrites who planned the assassination of the Prophet ﷺ during the assassination attempt on his life ﷺ after the expedition of Tabūk.
- * Mu'āwiyah's attempt to assassinate 'Umar when he went to al-Shām [Greater Syria].
- * Mu'āwiyah's attempted assassination of al-Ashtar al-Nakha'ī and 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd among others.
- * Mu'āwiyah was the leader of oppressive rulers.
- * Establishing that many of the Muhājirūn, Anṣār and Tābi'īn condemned Mu'āwiyah and criticised him.
- * Mu'āwiyah and his father would take false oaths.
- * Mu'āwiyah extinguished many of the practices of the Messenger ﷺ.

Among other offences that have been falsely conjured up by the slanderous liars¹, and among other distortions of fact by people who play with texts dishonestly by authenticating unreliable and fabricated narrations condemning Mu'āwiyah,

1 See some of these fabrications and others a book, *al-Suḥbah wa al-Šaḥābah* by Ḥasan ibn Farḥān al-Mālikī.

while declaring unreliable the authentic texts that expound on his virtues and accolades.

I am reminded by this, of the statement of Abū Towbah al-Ḥalabī, al-Rabī ibn Nāfi رحمهما الله:

Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān is the veil covering the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم. So, any man who lifts this veil will be bold [to attack] that which is behind the veil.¹

And the statement of Wakī ibn Jarrāh رحمهما الله:

Mu‘āwiyah رحمهما الله is like the door knocker, whoever moves it we accuse him of what lays beyond [i.e. the rest of the Ṣaḥābah].²

Likewise, the statement of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak رحمهما الله who said:

Mu‘āwiyah رحمهما الله, according to us, is a test. Whoever looks at him strangely, we accuse them of the entire community. I mean by that the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم.³

However, more terrible and distasteful than this is to criticise Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, Anas ibn Mālīk, Samurah ibn Jundub, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and Abū Hurayrah among others, May Allah be pleased with them all.

The third part of this trivet is the criticism of the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah like Ibn Taymiyyah رحمهما الله, Ibn al-Qayyim رحمهما الله, Ibn Kathīr رحمهما الله, al-Dhahabī رحمهما الله, and those before and after them.

1 Narrated by al-Khatīb in his *Tārīkh* (1/209), and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/209), see also *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr (11/450)

2 Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/210)

3 Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/211)

I had sincerely wished that the person who writes about such moral defects, that he begins with his own flaws, and save his heart from bearing enmity towards the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and save his tongue from speaking unfavourably about them.

وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

As to those [believers] who come after them they [shall] say: Our Rabb! Forgive us, and our brothers who preceded us in faith. And let not into our hearts any malice towards those who believe. Our Rabb! Indeed You are Most Kind Most Merciful.¹

Imām Aḥmad رحمه الله said:

Whoever belittles any of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, or bears any ill-feelings towards them on account of any incident that occurred, or mentions their flaws, then such a person is an innovator [in the religion] and will remain as such until he incurs mercy upon all of them and maintains a clean heart towards all of them.²

Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله has mentioned in *al-Wāsiṭiyyah*:

... from the foundation principles of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah is that their hearts and tongues are free of anything against the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, just as Allah سبحانه وتعالى described them:

As to those [believers] who come after them they [shall] say: Our Rabb! Forgive us, and our brothers who preceded us in faith. And let not into our

1 Sūrah al-Hashr: 10

2 See 'Manāqib al-Imām Aḥmad' (pg 210) by Abū al-Faraj, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Abī Ḥasan Ibn al-Jowzī (d.597AH/1201CE), 'al-Kifāyah Fī 'ilm al-Riwāyah' (pg 51) by al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī (d.463AH/1071CE)

hearts any malice towards those who believe. Our Rabb! Indeed You are Most Kind Most Merciful.

This book covers a number of topics:

- * A section dedicated to responding to those narrations that are quoted in criticism of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- * A section dedicated to responding to those narrations that have been declared unauthentic which mention the virtue and excellence of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- * A section dedicated to responding to the lies and propaganda against Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- * A section dedicated to the virtues and excellence of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- * A section dedicated to the praise of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه by the earliest generations of Muslims.
- * A section dedicated to opinions of the earliest generations of Muslims regarding those who curse Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- * A section dedicated to the consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah on the obligatory duty of Muslims to remain silent as regards to what happened between the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

The Mu'āwiyah haters take every precaution in covering up the texts that have come in praise of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and mention his merit by distorting these texts or rejecting them, but how do they think they will get away with that? Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned in his collection of *fatāwā* [legal verdicts]:

You shall never find an innovator except that he loves to conceal those texts that contradict him. He hates these texts just as he hates to bring them into the open or narrate them or speak about them, just as he hates those who do [mention these texts].¹

1 *Al-Fatāwa* (20/161) by Ibn Taymiyyah.

For the sake of Allah, and then that of history, these fabrications and propaganda against Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه have no basis. Were it not for the fact that these fabrications have blackened some pages, and the authors of such statements insinuating that this was investigative academic research, and the liberation of Islamic history, it would have been better to ignore these fabrications rather than delve into it. For indeed it is better for the extermination of such views, and muffling of the voices of those who utter them, that these baseless views be simply ignored, since the mention of them might alert people of ignorance.

I have named this book, *The unsheathing of the arrowhead in defense of Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān*. I ask Allah to make it beneficial, and that it is done solely for His sake.

Most exalted is your Rabb — the Rabb of Invincible Might — above all they ascribe [to Him], and eternal peace upon all the messengers, For all praise belongs to Allah [alone] the Rabb of all the Worlds.

And may Allah send blessings and salutations upon our Prophet Muḥammad and upon all his family and all his Ṣaḥābah.



Chapter One

Responding to Those Aḥādīth Which Have Been Quoted in Criticism of Mu‘āwiyah

Know well that the narrations that have been mentioned in criticism of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه are either authentic but do not give the meaning inferred by the people who quote them as criticism, or they are clear in criticism of Mu‘āwiyah but are unreliable.

Imām al-Nawawī رحمه الله¹, in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, said:

The scholars have said: “Those narrations that have come in which the apparent meanings indicate a negative view of any Ṣaḥābī, it is obligatory to interpret them [appropriately].” They have further said: “It has not occurred in the narrations of the reliable narrators except that there is a plausible explanation.”²

Abū al-‘Abbās Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله, in the collection of his *Fatāwā*³ and his “reply to the question of the people of al-Raḥabah”⁴, said:

... and Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān are all from the Ṣaḥābah. They have many merits and virtues and much of what is said of them is a lie, and the truth of it — if it is indeed true — then they were people of scholarly discretion; and such a person if his scholarly judgement is correct he receives twice the reward and if he errs he still receives a reward and his mistake is forgiven.

1 Abū Zakariyyā, Yahya ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī al-Shafi‘ī (d. 676 A.H / 1278 CE)

2 *Al-Minhāj, Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (15/175)

3 4/431

4 Pg. 106

In *al-Manār al-Munīf*¹, Ibn al-Qayyim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has clearly stated that there is no reliable narration in criticism of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Ḥasan Farḥān al-Mālikī ² and others have mentioned narrations in criticism of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which can be sub-divided into reliable narrations, weak narrations, and fabricated narrations.

We shall begin with the weak, unreliable, and fabricated narrations before dealing with the reliable narrations that have been collected and then misrepresented.

1 Pg 94

2 Ḥasan ibn Farḥān al-Mālikī is a Saudi journalist and media writer

The Unreliable and Fabricated Narrations That Have Been Quoted in Criticism of Mu‘āwiyah

The First Narration

The narration of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه from the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم:

If you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him!

1. This has been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil*¹ (2/146), (5/200), (5/314) as well as by Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍū‘āt*² (2/265) with the wording, “stone him,” and by Ibn ‘Asākir³ in *Tārīkh Dimashq*⁴ (59/155), all of them with the narration of Mujālid ibn Sa‘īd from Abū al-Wadāk, from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه.
2. This has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (7/83), by al-Balādhurī⁵ in *Ansāb as-Ashrāf*⁶ (5/136), by Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (2/256), and by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/55), all of them from the narration of ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān from Abū Naḍrah, from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه.

1 *al-Kāmil fī Du‘afā al-Rijāl* by Abū Aḥmad, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Adī al-Jurjānī (d. 365 A.H / 976 CE) this work of his is a collection of biographical details of narrators of ḥadīth who were considered weak. He also identified a number of narrations of that narrator under his biography, hence indicating the flaw in that narration.

2 *al-Mowḍū‘āt min al-Aḥādīth al-Marfū‘āt* by Abū al-Faraj ibn al-Jowzī. This work of his is a collection of fabricated narrations attributed to the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم.

3 Abū al-Qāsim, ‘Alī ibn al-Hasan ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571 A.H/1175 CE)

4 *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn ‘Asākir is an encyclopaedia of the history of Damascus and has been printed in over 70 volumes. It covers the history of every person who visited or lived in Damascus during that period, not limited to ḥadīth narrators but political figures as well. Ibn ‘Asākir attempted to collect everything that was said regarding these figures without any distinction between reliable and unreliable, he aimed to provide a chain of narration for every statement recorded.

5 Aḥmad ibn Yahya al-Balādhurī (d. 279 A.H / 893 CE).

6 This work deals with the biographical details and genealogy of the noble family of the Blessed Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم.

3. It has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (2/209), by Ibn Ḥibbān¹ in *al-Majrūhīn*² (1/35), by Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (2/265), all of them from the narration of ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb al-Rawājīnī — from al-Hakam ibn Ḍahīr — from ‘Āṣim — from Zirr — from Ibn Mas‘ūd — from the Messenger ﷺ.³
4. It has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (7/112) who says, ‘Alī ibn Sa‘īd narrated to us – he said – al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Isa al-Rāzi narrated to us – he said – Salamah ibn al-Faḍl narrated to us – he said – Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Taymī narrated to us — from Abū Umāmah ibn Sahl ibn Hunayf — from his father (Sahl ibn Hunayf) — from the Messenger ﷺ: “If you see so-and-so on my pulpit, kill him!”
5. It was also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (6/112) from the narration of Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn al-Sadfi — from Sufyān ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī — from Maṣṣūr ibn Salamah — from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl — from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad — from his father — from Jābir — from the Messenger ﷺ: “If you see on my pulpit, then kill him — he meant so-and-so...”⁴
6. It has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419) who said: “Ibn Sa‘īd narrated to us – who said – Abū Shaybah ibn Abī Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah narrated to us — from Khālīd ibn Makhlad — from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl — from Ja‘far — from a group of the participants of Badr — from the Messenger ﷺ.
7. It has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (5/101), by al-‘Uqaylī⁵ in

1 Abū Hātim, Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354 A.H / 966 CE)

2 *Kitāb al-Majrūhīn min al-Muḥaddithīn wa al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* by Ibn Ḥibban is a collection of biographical data of weak and unreliable narrators of ḥadīth. He also has a book titled *al-Thiqāt* in which he collected the names of those whom he considered reliable. However, many scholars do not consider the inclusion of a narrator in *al-Thiqāt* sufficient for ratification of a narrator due to his lenient standard in this work of his.

3 See also *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (5/138)

4 See also *Mizān al-I’tidāl* by al-Dhahabī (2/172)

5 Abū Ja‘far, Muḥammad ibn ‘Amr al-‘Uqaylī (d. 322 A.H / 934 CE)

*al-Ḍuʿafāʾ*¹ (3/997), by al-Khatīb in his *Tārīkh* (12/181), by Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍūʿāt* (2/266), by Ibn ʿAsākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/157) all of them from the narration of Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb from Ḥammād ibn Zayd who said: “It was said to Ayyūb that ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd narrates from Ḥasan that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “If you see Muʿāwiyah on my pulpit, kill him!” to which he — Ayyūb — replied: “ʿAmr has lied!”²

As for the First Chain

In this chain appears Mujālid ibn Saʿīd al-Hamadānī al-Kūfī.

- * Al-Bukhārī said of him: “Yaḥya al-Qaṭṭān considered him weak [as a narrator] and Ibn Mahdī would not narrate from him.”
- * Al-Jūzajānī said of him: “His narrations are to be considered weak.”³
- * Aḥmad said of him: “Not [worth] anything.”⁴ In another report Aḥmad said: “Such-and such – then moved his hand – however, he adds to the chain of transmission,” and in another report from him he said, “Mujālid from al-Shaʿbī and others, weak, how many a strange narration from Mujālid!”
- * Yaḥya said of him: “He was weak.” He also said: “I do not consider his narrations admissible.”⁵
- * Al-Nasāʾī said of him: “A Kūfahn, weak.”⁶
- * Ibn ʿAdī said of him: “Most of what he narrates is uncorroborated.”⁷

1 An encyclopaedia collecting the biographical details of weak narrators of ḥadīth.

2 See also *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (5/136)

3 *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (biography no. 126)

4 “Laysa bī Shay” means not anything, this term is generally used to describe narrators of extreme weakness. Sometimes Ibn Maʿīn used this term when he refers to a narrator who had very little ḥadīth — translator

5 “Lā Aḥtaju bīhī,” this term is used for narrators with abundance of errors on account of weak memory and lack of accuracy — translator

6 *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ wa al-Matrūkīn* (biography no. 552)

7 *al-Kāmil* (6/423), *al-Tahdhīb* (4/24)

As for the Second Chain

In this chain appears ‘Alī ibn Zayd Jud‘ān.

- * Aḥmad said of him: “Not [worth] anything.”
- * Yahya ibn Ma‘īn said of him: “Not that strong.”¹ In another narration: “Not all that [reliable],” and in the report from al-Dūrī, “not an authoritative source.”²
- * Al-Jūzajānī said of him: “Careless in his narration, weak, not to be relied upon.”³
- * Abū Ḥātim said of him: “Not strong [by any standard], his narrations are to be recorded but not considered an authoritative source, and he used to advocate Shī‘ī views.”⁴
- * Ibn Khuzaymah said of him: “I do not consider him reliable on account of his weak memory.”
- * Ibn Sa‘d said of him: “Plentiful in terms of narration, but there is weakness in him, he is not to be considered an authoritative source.”⁵
- * Abū Zur‘ah said of him: “Not strong [by any standard].”
- * Al-Tirmidhī said of him: “Truthful, except that he elevates [chains of narrations to the Messenger ﷺ] that which others suspend [at the Ṣaḥābah].”⁶
- * Al-Dāraqūṭnī said of him: “There remains – in my assessment – infirmness in him.”⁷

1 *Tārikh ibn Ma‘īn*, narration of al-Dārimī (141)

2 *Tārikh ibn Ma‘īn*, narration of al-Dūrī (4/341)

3 *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (biography no.185)

4 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (6/186)

5 *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/252)

6 *Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī* (Ḥadīth no. 2678)

7 *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu‘afā’* (biography no. 4265)

- * Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* has said: “He was extreme in advocating Shī‘ī doctrine, and despite his weakness, his narrations may be recorded.”¹
- * Ḥammād ibn Zayd said of him: “He substitutes his narrations.”²
- * Both *al-Nasā’ī* and Ibn ‘Uyaynah have declared him weak.³
- * Ibn Ḥibbān said of him in *al-Majrūḥīn* (2/78): “He erred, this occurred often, as a result of which he deserves to be abandoned.”
- * ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān has been corroborated, or ‘followed-up’⁴. ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Abī Naḍrah has narrated this jointly, from the latter’s father with that chain as it is recorded in by ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūḥīn* (1/173). However, this corroboration is void due to the narrator in the chain – the person from whom Ibn Ḥibbān narrates – Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Bishr ibn Faḍālah, Abū Bishr, the jurist. Ibn Ḥibbān says of him: “He was from those who would fabricate the text of reports, and he would substitute the chains of narration to make it seem as though they were from reliable narrators, and narrate outrageous reports from reliable narrators as a result of which he deserves to be abandoned.” Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned a number of his narrations in *al-Majrūḥīn*⁵, this particular narration among them, he then said: “These narrations that we have mentioned; most of them have had their chains substituted and these are known to be his handiwork.”

As for the Third Chain

In this chain appears al-Ḥakam ibn Ḥaḥīr al-Fazārī, al-Kūfī.

1 *al-Kāmil* (5/201)

2 *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (3/958)

3 *al-Tahdhīb* (3/126)

4 i.e he has narrated this jointly with others and not independently.

5 *al-Majrūḥīn* (1/171)

- * Ibn Ḥibban says of him in *al-Majrūḥīn*: “The Kūfahns narrate from him. He used to utter profanities against the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ﷺ and relate from trustworthy narrators [falsely] things which were fabricated, and it is he who narrated from ‘Āṣim — from Zirr...” and he completed the narration.¹
- * Yahya ibn Ma‘īn said of him: “He is not [worth] anything,” and on another occasion he said, “a confounded liar!”
- * Al-Nasāī said of him: “One whose narrations are abandoned, a Kūfan”²
- * Al-Bukhārī said of him: “One whose narrations are rejected.”
- * Al-Jūzajānī said of him: “failure.”
- * Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* said of him: “Most of his narrations are uncorroborated.”³

Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qaḍī has jointly narrated this with al-Hakam ibn Ḥaḥīr as is mentioned by Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūḥīn* (2/163). However, Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qaḍī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, the Kūfan, is weak, especially in that which he narrated from memory after being assigned a post in the judiciary.

- * Ibn Ḥibbān said in *al-Thiqāt*: “Towards the end he erred regularly and his memory failed him. Therefore, the narrations of those who heard from him in his early days in Wāsiṭ do not have confusion — like Yazīd ibn Harūn, Ishāq al-Azraq — as for those who heard from him later on in Kūfah, their narrations have many mistakes.”⁴
- * Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* said: “The general status of his narrations is one of reliability and acceptable. However, that which occurred in his narrations

1 *al-Majrūḥīn* (1/304)

2 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* (biography no.127)

3 *al-Kāmil* (2/210)

4 *al-Thiqāt* (6/444)

which is objectionable is on account of weakness of memory and not deliberate narration of that which is deserving of being declared weak.”¹

- * Sāliḥ Jazarah said: “He is truthful, but when he took up the post in the judiciary his memory became inconsistent.”

As for the Fourth Chain

Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (6/112) has indicated to the occurrence of a non-corroborated, solitary narration by weak narrator, he said: “And this [narration] with this [wording] I have not recorded it except from [the narration of] ‘Alī ibn Sa‘īd.”

Furthermore, appearing in this chain is Salamah ibn al-Faḍl, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, al-Abrash, and he is weak. He has many contradictions and solitary narrations. As for that which he narrates from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq under the genre of Maghāzī² only, it is stronger than the rest even though a general status of weak is accorded to his narrations.

- * Al-Bukhārī said of him: “He has many non-corroborated solitary narrations. ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī declared him weak³. ‘Alī said of him: “We did not leave Rayy, until we disposed of his narrations [that which we recorded of it].”⁴
- * Abū Ḥātim said of him: “He is within the category of truthfulness, yet there occurs in his narrations lone contradictions. His narrations may be recorded, but not relied upon as proof.”⁵
- * Al-Nasā‘ī and Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah have both declared him weak.⁶

1 *al-Kāmil* (4/22)

2 The military expeditions of the Prophet ﷺ, it extends to general aspects of sīrah also well.

3 *al-Tahdhīb* (2/165)

4 *al-Tarīkh al-Kabīr* (4/84)

5 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (4/169)

6 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* (biography no. 1487)

- * Al-Hākim has said of him: “He is not strong according to them [scholars of ḥadīth].”
- * Ibn Ḥibbān included him in *al-Thiqāt* and said: “He errs and contradicts.”¹
- * Ibn Maʿīn, Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Saʿd considered him relatively reliable.
- * Ibn ʿAdī, in *al-Kāmil* (3/341), under his biographical details, has said: “And he has — besides that which he narrated from Ibn Ishaq and others under the genre of Maghāzī — many independent, solitary, lone, non-corroborated narrations. I have not found in his narrations any narration which transgressed the boundaries in terms of contradiction, his narrations are passively weak.”

However in this narration we find the problem of implicit narration of Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Yasār, and he was described — may Allah have mercy on him — with evasiveness. When he narrates in the implicit form he evades², especially if he narrates other than the Maghāzī genre. So if his evasiveness is present, the narration is not accepted; and the solitary nature of this narration indicates that he has indeed evaded.

As for the Fifth Chain

In this chain appears Sufyān ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī, al-Maṣīṣī. Regarding him, Ibn ʿAdī, in *al-Kāmil* (3/419), said: “He used to ‘steal narrations’ [by attributing a fictitious corroboratory narration] and interferes with the chains [by substituting a narrator or omitting a narrator — usually an unreliable narrator — between reliable narrators],” then mentioned this particular narration of his and said: “Sufyān al-Fazārī has interfered with this since he said, “from Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad, from his father, from Jābir,” and he has also narrated it from Maṣṣūr ibn Salamah, from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl — and Sulaymān is reliable and Maṣṣūr

¹ *al-Thiqāt* (8/278)

² The Arabic term is *tadlīs*.

is acceptable — whereas this is only related by way of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, from a group of the participants of Badr¹ from the Prophet ﷺ.” Sufyān ibn Muḥammad has narrations other than those mentioned for which he has absolutely no corroboration from the reliable narrators, as he has many fabricated narrations along with narrations for which he has forged supplementary chains from the narrations of reliable narrators. Additionally his narrations have names of narrators who have been switched as well as continuity for chains that have [known] missing links above the stage of the Tābi‘īn. His weakness is evidently clear.²

As for the Sixth Chain

In this chain appears Khālīd ibn Makhḷad al-Qaṭawānī, who — even though he is from the narrators in *al-Bukhārī* — is weak in narration.

- * Aḥmad said of him: “He has many narrations which were not corroborated (despite his weakness).”³
- * Ibn Sa‘d said of him: “Excessively weak, in addition to extreme Shī‘ī thought.”⁴
- * Abū Ḥātim said of him: “His narrations may be recorded, but not independently considered admissible as evidence.”⁵
- * Abū Dāwūd said of him: “Truthful, although he adopted Shī‘ī thought.”⁶
- * Yahya ibn Ma‘īn and Ibn ‘Adī said of him: “No problem in him [his narration].”⁷

1 There is an obvious interruption in the continuity of this chain – the translator.

2 See *Lisān al-Mīzān* by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (3/93)

3 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta‘dīl* (3/354)

4 *al-Ṭabaqāt* (6/406)

5 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta‘dīl* (3/354)

6 *Su‘ālāt al-Ājurri lī Abī Dāwūd* (1/103)

7 *al-Tahdhīb* (1/531), *Tārīkh Ibn Ma‘īn* narration of al-Dārimī (1/104), *al-Kāmil* by Ibn ‘Adī (3/35)

* Al-‘Ijlī and Ibn Ḥibbān both deemed him reliable.¹

As for the Seventh Chain

It has a number of defects:

1. It has been narrated in the passive voice — indicating its weakness — as related by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (5/101), al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (3/998), al-Khatīb in his *Tārīkh* (12/181), Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mawḍū‘āt* (2/266) and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/157): “It was said to Ayyūb, ‘indeed ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd narrates from Ḥasan,’ and the person saying this is not known.”
2. Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī said that this narration is a lie, as recorded by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (5/101), (5/103).
3. In the chain appears ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd, Abū ‘Uthmān al-Baṣrī:
 - * Ayyūb and Yūnūs ibn ‘Ubayd both said: “‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd used to lie in his narrations.”
 - * Al-Dāraqūṭnī said of him: “Weak!”
 - * Ibn Ma‘īn said of him: “Not [worth] anything.”²
 - * Al-Nasā‘ī said of him: “One whose narrations are abandoned.”³
 - * Ibn Ḥibbān said of him: “He was a caller to Mu‘tazilite doctrine, and uttered profanities against the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and with all of that he lied in his narrations out of carelessness not intentionally.”⁴
 - * Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* said: “Abhorred, excessively weak in narration, openly declared innovation.”⁵

1 *Ma‘rifat al-Thiqāt* by al-‘Ijlī (1/321) and *al-Thiqāt* by Ibn Ḥibbān (8/224)

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Ma‘īn* narration of al-Dūrī (4/275)

3 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* (biography no. 445)

4 *al-Majrūhīn* (2/69)

5 *al-Kāmil* (5/110)

Therefore, ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd was a confounded liar, especially from that which he narrates from Ḥasan. Ḥumayd al-Ṭawīl, Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī and Ibn ‘Awn have all clearly stated this. So, this chain is unsubstantiated. And even if the chain is proven it is from the Mursal narrations of Ḥasan, and the Mursal narrations of Ḥasan are not considered.

In *al-Muntakhab min al-‘ilal li al-Khallāl*¹ (229), al-Khallāl said: “‘Abd Allāh narrated to us, from his father — who said — Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb narrated to us — who said — Ḥammād ibn Zayd narrated to us — saying — a man said to Ayyūb, ‘indeed ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd narrates from Ḥasan that the Messenger ﷺ said: “If you see — meaning Mu‘āwiyah — on the pulpit...” to which he — Ayyūb — said: “Amr has lied.’ He — ‘Abd Allāh — said: ‘I asked my father to narrate to me the narrations of ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd — I know them — so he dictated to me from the narration of Sahl ibn Yūsuf from ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd from Ḥasan, then he said, ‘Leave it, for he has lied against Ḥasan!’”

It is evidently clear from all of this that this narration is baseless, in terms of the chain of narration as well as the text. A number of scholars have pointed out the fact that this narration is baseless.

1. Al-Bukhārī said in *al-Tārīkh al-Awsat*:

Ḥammad ibn Salamah related from ‘Alī ibn Zayd, from Abū Naḍraḥ, “when Mu‘āwiyah delivered the sermon from the pulpit, a man stood up and ascribed to the Messenger ﷺ, ‘if you see him on the pulpit kill him,’ and another said, ‘write to ‘Umar,’ — and they did so — but ‘Umar was already murdered.” However, this is a Mursal narration and Abū Naḍraḥ did not witness those days. ‘Abd al-Razzāq says — by way of — Ibn ‘Uyaynah, from ‘Alī ibn Zayd, from Abū Sa‘īd from the Messenger ﷺ and this has been interpolated, and not established. It has also been narrated by Mujālid, from Abū al-Wadāk, from Abū Sa‘īd from the Messenger ﷺ, and this is extremely weak. Aḥmad said of Mujālid that his narrations are as if they

1 Compiled by al-Muwaffaq ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī (d. 620 A.H / 1223 CE)

are dreams. Yaḥya ibn Saʿīd said if one wished, he would have made them all from al-Shaʿbī, from Masrūq, from ʿAbd Allāh. It has also been related by way of Maʿmar, from Ibn Tāwūs, from his father, from a man, from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAmr from the Messenger ﷺ in this incident, and this narration is interrupted [in its chain], not to be relied upon. Al-Aʿmash narrates from Sālim, from Thowbān, from the Messenger ﷺ regarding this incident. However, Sālim did not hear from Thowbān, as for al-Aʿmash it is uncertain whether he heard this from Sālim or not. Abū Bakr ibn al-Aʿyāsh relates from al-Aʿmash that he said: “We seek forgiveness from Allah for things we would narrate on the basis of amazement, they have taken it as part of the religion. The Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ were present when Muʿāwiyah became a governor during the era of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه and after that for a period of ten years, yet no one stood up with the intention of killing him. [Al-Bukhārī says] This is a clear indication that these narrations have absolutely no basis and no report of this nature has been proven from the Messenger ﷺ with regard to any of his Ṣaḥābah. It is only people of weakness who spoke of this among themselves, except that which occurred during Jāhilyyah, and then they entered into Islam, and Islam wiped clean all that occurred before it.

2. Abū Jaʿfar al-ʿUqaylī, in *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ* (1/280), after mentioning a number of narrations — among them this narration — said: “And none of these texts have been authentically proven from the Prophet ﷺ.”
3. Ibn ʿAdī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419).
4. Ibn Ḥibbān said in *al-Majrūḥīn* (1/171), under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Bishr ibn Faḍālah after mentioning some narrations from him — among them this narration: “These narrations that we have mentioned here, most of them have been substituted and been interfered with, it is his handiwork.” For this reason Ibn Ḥajar said in *Tahdhīb al-Tahthīb* (3/164): “Others besides him — Ibn Ḥibbān — have rejected that which Ḥammād ibn Salamah relates from him — Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad — from Abū Naḍrah, from Abū Saʿīd...”

5. Al-Jawzaqānī in *al-Abāṭīl* (1/200): “This narration is a fabrication, absolutely baseless, it is nothing except from the inventions of the innovators, who are fabricators. May Allah forsake them in both worlds! As for anyone who believes this, or its like, or even thinks that the Messenger ﷺ said such things, then he is a heretic, out of the religion.”
6. Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (2/266) said: “This narration is not authentic from the Messenger ﷺ,” in (2/264) Ibn al-Jowzī mentioned this narration from those which have fabricated for the purpose of vilifying Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه.
7. Ibn ‘Asākir, in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/157), said: “All these narrations are questionable.”
8. Abū al-‘Abbās Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (4/380): “These narrations are not found in the books of Islam, they are lies according to ḥadīth experts and Ibn al-Jowzī has mentioned it in *al-Mowḍū‘āt*.”
9. Al-Dhahabī said in *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/150): “This is a lie. It has also been said — through interpretation — that it refers to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Tābūh, the hypocrite.”
10. Ibn Kathīr, in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/419), said: “This narration is a lie, without doubt.”
11. Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī in *Taḥṣīr al-Janān* (38).
12. Al-Showkānī in *al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah* (407).
13. Al-Suyūṭī in *al-Fawā‘id min al-La‘ālī al-Maṣnū‘ah* (1/388).
14. Ibn ‘Arrāq al-Kinānī in *Tanhīz al-Sharī‘ah al-Marfū‘ah* (2/8).

Furthermore, this narration is baseless if one considers only the text, for two reasons:

- I. The pulpit was ascended by individuals far worse than Mu'āwiyah, but despite that the Messenger ﷺ did not instruct that they be killed.
- II. It would be a criticism of the Ṣaḥābah, especially those whom this narration reached since they failed to act on it by hastening to kill Mu'āwiyah.

Abū al-'Abbās Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (4/380):

These narrations are not found in the books of Islam, they are lies according to ḥadīth experts and Ibn al-Jowzī has mentioned it in *al-Mowḍū'āt*. Another factor that shows this narration to be a blatant lie is the fact that the pulpit of the Messenger ﷺ was ascended — after the death of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه — by individuals whom Mu'āwiyah was superior to, by consensus of the Muslims. So, if it were obligatory to kill those who ascended merely on account of ascending the pulpit, it would be obligatory to kill all of them. Furthermore, this goes contrary to what is known of the religion by necessity, that a person be killed merely on account of ascending the pulpit. And if it is said that it was meant by this that Mu'āwiyah be killed for taking charge of the affairs of the Muslims, then it can also be said that people, whom Mu'āwiyah was more virtuous than, assumed leadership of the Muslims, why was there no instruction to kill them. Again, this goes contrary to that which was recurrently passed on through the prophetic tradition which prohibits killing or fighting with the leaders of the Muslims. In addition to this, the consensus of Muslims goes contrary to that, since they did not attempt to kill those who assumed leadership nor did they permit it.

Ibn Kathīr, in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/434), has said: “This narration is a lie, without doubt. Were it reliable, the Ṣaḥābah would have not wasted any time in implementing it since no kind of censure would compromise their carrying out the instruction of Allah.”

Also, see what has been written by Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī al-Makkī in *Taḥṣīr al-Janān* (pg.38).

The following are some academic observations on the attempt to authenticate this narrations by Hasan al-Mālikī, “if you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him!”

1. His referencing to secondary sources without referring to the original sources is an indication that he has not actually come across the narration:

- » That which is narrated by way of al-Ḥakam ibn Ḥazīr, from ‘Āṣim, from Zirr, from Ibn Mas‘ūd, from the Messenger ﷺ: “If you see Mu‘āwiyah...”. He has ascribed it to *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/149), whereas the narration has been recorded by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (2/209), and Ibn Ḥibban in *al-Majrūhīn* (1/35) and Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (2/265).
- » That which is narrated by way of Sufyān ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī, from Maṣṣūr ibn Salamah, from Bilāl ibn Sulaymān, from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, from his father, from the Messenger ﷺ: “If you see so-and-so...”. He ascribed it to *Mīzan al-I‘tidāl* (3/248), whereas it has been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419).
- » That which has been narrated by way of Khālīd ibn Makhḥad, from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl, from Ja‘far, from a group of the participants of Badr, from the Messenger ﷺ. He has ascribed it to *Mīzan al-I‘tidāl* (3/248), whereas it has been narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419).

2. His deceitfulness in mentioning corroboratory narrations:

Al-Mālikī has mentioned a ‘follow-up’ chain for the narration, “if you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him,” which has been related by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419) which has been narrated by way of Khālīd ibn Makhḥad from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl. He mentioned the corroboratory chain which is related by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419) by way of Sufyān al-Fazārī from Maṣṣūr ibn Salamah, from Sulaymān ibn Bilāl.

However, the second chain is merely an invention of Sufyān ibn Muḥammad al-Fazārī as mentioned by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/419).

3. He has said regarding the narration, “if you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him,” it has been narrated from ‘Āṣim through four chains. However, he only mentions three chains. The first, by way of Sharīk from ‘Āṣim. The second, by way of al-Ḥakam ibn Ḥalīf from ‘Āṣim and ascribed it to *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*. And the third, he did not ascribe it to anyone, whereas it is in *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (5/137).

The Second Narration

May Allah curse the rider, and the leader, and the driver.

The Narration of Safīnah:

It is narrated by al-Bazzār in his *Musnad* (9/286): al-Sakan ibn Sa‘īd narrated to us – he said – ‘Abd al-Samad narrated to us – he said – my father narrated to us, and Ḥammād ibn Salamah narrated to us — from Sa‘īd ibn Jumhān¹ — from Safīnah رضي الله عنه:

The Prophet ﷺ was sitting when a man passed by riding a camel, in the front was a man leading the camel, and from the back there was a man driving the camel [urging it on], so he — ﷺ — said: “May Allah curse the rider, and the leader, and the driver.”

The response to this is as follows:

- a. Supposing the authenticity of this narration, it does not mention Mu‘āwiyah.
- b. The narration is rejected on account of weakness in addition to it being uncorroborated. A clear indication of this is what has been narrated by

1 This is the correct name, it appears in the original as Juhmān, which is an error.

al-Balādhurī in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (129), by way of ‘Abd al-Wārith ibn Sa‘īd , from Sa‘īd ibn Jumhān, from Safīnah... “May Allah curse the carrier, the one being carried, the leader, and the driver.” The carrier is a camel, is it imaginable that the Messenger ﷺ would curse an animal? It has been narrated in *Saḥīḥ Muslim* (narration no. 2598) that he - ﷺ - said: “Those who curse shall not be witnesses and intercessors on the Day of Judgement,” and it is he - ﷺ - who said, as narrated in *Saḥīḥ Muslim* (2595) by ‘Imran ibn Ḥusayn: “We were with Allah’s Messenger ﷺ in some of his journeys and there was a woman from the Anṣār riding a she-camel that it shied and she invoked curse upon that. Allah’s Messenger ﷺ heard it and said, ‘Unload that and set it free for it has been cursed.’” ‘Imran said: “I still perceive that (she-camel) walking amongst people and none taking any notice of it.”

- c. The teacher of al-Bazzār, al-Sakan ibn Sa‘īd , is an “unknown” as it appears that no biographical details of him are available. Al-Haythamī, in *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* (7/395) said: “The teacher of al-Bazzār, al-Sakan ibn Sa‘īd , I do not know him”

The Narration of Ḥasan

Al-Ṭabarānī narrates in *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* (3/71, narration 2798):

Zakariyya ibn Yaḥyā al-Sājī narrated to us — he said — Muḥammad ibn Bashshār narrated to us — he said — ‘Abd al-Malik ibn al-Sabbāh al-Masma‘ī narrated to us — he said — ‘Imran ibn Ḥudayr narrated to us — I think — from Abū Mijlāz, who said: “‘Amr ibn al-Āṣ and al-Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah said to Mu‘āwiyah that Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī is unable to express himself distinctly and he has something to say and an opinion to express, we know what he says and he speaks but does not get any kind of response. So Mu‘āwiyah told them not to do anything, but they relented and ‘Amr ascended the pulpit and praised Allah and then spoke ill of ‘Alī. Thereafter, al-Mughīrah ascended the pulpit, praised Allah and spoke ill of ‘Alī. It was then said to Ḥasan to ascend but he refused to do so unless he was given assurance that if he spoke the truth they should believe him and if he

spoke falsely they should repudiate him. He was then given that assurance and then ascended the pulpit, praised Allah and said: “By Allah, O ‘Amr, and you O Mughīrah, you both are aware that the Messenger ﷺ said, ‘Allah has cursed the driver and the rider’, one of them is so-and-so.” They replied, “by Allah, certainly,” he then said, “I ask you by Allah, O Mu‘āwiyah and you O Mughīrah, are you both not aware that the Messenger ﷺ cursed ‘Amr, with every statement he ended it with a curse?” to which they replied, “by Allah, certainly.” He then said, “I ask you by Allah, O ‘Amr, and you O Mu‘āwiyah, are you both not aware that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ cursed the nation of this individual [al-Mughīrah]?” They replied, “Certainly!...”

This narration is baseless, both in terms of the text and of the chain of narration.

In terms of the chain, ‘Imran ibn Hudayr said, “I think it is from Abū Mijlaz,” but it is not certain who the speculator is exactly. Whoever the speculator is, there is no absolute certainty that it is from Abū Mijlaz, Lāḥiq ibn Ḥumayd, as it could be from him or from anybody else.

As for al-Mālīkī, he has cut the narration short and not mentioned it in its entirety. The incident related in this narration has objections to it since it describes the Messenger ﷺ cursing ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ with the ending of every statement he made in a sermon. How is it possible that the Messenger ﷺ cursed an individual with every statement in a single sermon, yet appoint him as the leader of a military expedition in the Battle of Dhāt al-Salāsīl as is mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukharī* (3462)?!

Furthermore, does this not contradict that which has been authentically narrated in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (121) that on the occasion of the demise of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ he began to cry, and then his son consoled him telling him: “O my beloved father, has not the Messenger of Allah given you glad tidings of such-and-such?”

Does this narration not contradict what has been mentioned of the Messenger ﷺ testifying to the faith of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ as is related by Aḥmad in *al-Musnad* (17843), al-Nasā’ī in *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* (8301) and Ibn Ḥibbān (7092), all of them by way of the narration of Mūsā ibn ‘Alī ibn Rabāh — from his father — from ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ ﷺ who said:

There was a great panic in Madinah which caused people to scatter in different directions. I noticed Sālim the freed slave of Abū Ḥudhayfah taking his sword, after having seen what he had done I also took my sword when the Messenger ﷺ entered upon us and he said: “O people, were it not be that your fear be towards Allah and His Messenger? What is this? Why have you not done as these two believing men have done?”

The reply to this is left to the one who distorts the texts.

With the above, the following two chains of this narration are responded to since they are narrated from the same chain:

- I. The Narration of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ
- II. The Narration of al-Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah

The Narration of Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib

Imām al-Bukhārī has related in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (1/274), al-Tirmidhī in *al-‘ilal* (381), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (4/208) by way of the narration from Salamah ibn al-Faḍl — from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq — from Salamah ibn Kuhayl — from Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib — from his father. Abū ‘Isa al-Tirmidhī said of this as it appears in *al-‘ilal* (714):

I asked Muḥammad about this narration and he said: “I know it.” I am not aware of him knowing this narration except by this one chain.

It has also been narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/204) by way of Salamah ibn al-Faḍl — from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq — from Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’

ibn ‘Āzib — from his father. It has also been narrated by al-Rūyānī in his *Musnad* (325) and this narration has a number of defects:

1. Appearing in this chain is Salamah ibn al-Faḍl, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, al-Abrash, and he is weak. He has many contradictions and solitary narrations. As for that which he narrates from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq under the genre of Maghāzī only, it is stronger than the rest even though a general status of weak is accorded to his narrations.
2. The implicit narration of Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Yasār, and he was described — may Allah have mercy on him — with evasiveness. When he narrates in the implicit form he is evasive, especially if he narrates other than the Maghāzī genre. So if his evasiveness is present, the narration is not accepted.
3. The irreconcilable disorder in this chain since it appears from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq from Salamah ibn Kuhayl, from Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’, from al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib, and it also appears without the mention of Salamah ibn Kuhayl from the narration of Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, from Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’, from his father [al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib]. For this reason al-Bukharī says in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (1/274): “They differ regarding its chain.”
4. Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib is relatively unknown as a narrator since none of the scholars have verified him as a narrator besides Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Thiqāt* (4/6). Al-Bukharī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (1/274) and Ibn Abī Ḥātim in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (2/89) have both mentioned him but remained silent on him. The silence of al-Bukharī and Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī does not amount to anything.
5. This narration is from the solitary narration of Salamah ibn Kuhayl, from Ibrāhīm ibn al-Barā’, and it is only Muḥammad ibn Ishāq who narrates it from him. It appears in *Aṭrāf al-Gharā’ib wa al-Afrād* (2/285):

The narration, “the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was sitting in a tent...” it has only been narrated by Salamah ibn Kuhayl, and it has been solely narrated from him by Muḥammad ibn Ishāq. An alternative narration

has been narrated from al-Barā, related by Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim in a book *Ṣiffīn* (218) from ‘Abd al-Ghaffār ibn al-Qāsim, from ‘Adī ibn Thābit, from al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib who said: “Abū Sufyān came along with Mu‘āwiyah, so the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, ‘O Allah, curse the follower and the one being followed. O Allah deal with the one with a protruding chest!’” So the son of al-Barā’ asked him who was the one with the protruding chest, he replied, “Mu‘āwiyah.”

This is not authentic since Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim is abandoned.

- * Abū Ḥātim said in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (8/468): “Exceptionally weak, his narrations are abandoned, his narrations are not to be recorded.”
- * Abū Ja‘far al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (4/300): “He adopted Shī‘ī thought, in his narrations there are many mistakes as well as irreconcilable disorder.”
- * Al-Jūzajānī said in *al-Shajarah fi Ahwāl al-Rijāl* (biography.109): “He used to deviate from the truth and inclined [towards the Shī‘ah].”
- * Abū Khaythamah said: “He was a confounded liar!”¹
- * Yaḥya said: “His narrations are not [worth] anything.”²
- * Al-Dāraqūṭnī said: “Weak.”³
- * Sāliḥ ibn Muḥammad said: “He narrated from the weak narrators, rejected narration [contradicting the reliable narrations].”⁴
- * Abūl Faṭḥ al-Azdī said: “He was extreme in his school, not praiseworthy in his narration.”⁵
- * Al-Dhahabī said in *Mīzan al-‘Itidāl* (4/253): “They abandoned him [his narrations].”

1 See *Lisān al-Mīzān* (3/267)

2 Ibid

3 Ibid

4 Ibid

5 Ibid

As for what al-Mālikī had said:

He has been ratified by Ibn Ḥibbān, as well as Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd and al-Khatīb has mentioned his biographical details.

I say: what next?! Besides Ibn Ḥibbān¹, all the other scholars of the science of adjudicating narrators have a unanimous declaration of abandonment of his narrations. Furthermore, Ibn Ḥibbān is sometimes known for leniency when it comes to ratifying narrators. What about when he is contradicted by all these other scholars?²

As for Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, he is ‘Izz al-Dīn, ‘Abd al-Hamīd ibn Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Madā’inī, the author of the book *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* (d. 655 A.H) from the major proponents of innovation and from those who sought to destroy Islam.³

As for the biographical data provided by al-Khatīb, it does not make any difference to the reliability of this narrator.

[In the chain of narration is] ‘Abd al-Ghaffār ibn al-Qāsim, Abū Maryam, al-Anṣārī, he was a Rafīḍī and a fabricator.

* ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī said: “He used to fabricate narrations.”

* Yahya ibn Ma‘īn said: “Not [worth] anything.”⁴

* Al-Bukharī said: “‘Abd al-Ghaffār ibn al-Qāsim ibn Qays ibn Fahd, not considered strong by them [scholars of ḥadīth].”⁵

* Abū Dāwūd said: “I heard from Shu‘bah — who said — I heard Simāk al-

1 *al-Thiqāt* (9/215)

2 For further reading on Ibn Ḥibbān's leniency in this regard, see ‘*al-Ṣārim al-Mankī*’ by Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī (104), *Mīzan al-ʾItidāl* (3/175), *Lisān al-Mīzān* (1/208), and ‘*al-Tankīl*’ by ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Mu‘allimī (1/437)

3 See what al-Mu‘allimī has written about him in ‘*al-Anwār al-Kāshifah*’ (pg152)

4 *Tārīkh ibn Ma‘īn* (3/366) narration of al-Dūrī

5 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (6/122)

Ḥanafī saying to Abū Maryam regarding something he said, ‘by Allah, you have lied!’ and I — Abū Dāwūd — testify that Abū Maryam is indeed a confounded liar, because I had met him and heard from him. His name is ‘Abd al-Ghaffār ibn al-Qāsim. Most of his narrations are baseless. Aḥmad said that Abū Maryam used to narrate of the affliction regarding ‘Uthmān.”¹

- * Abū Ḥātim and al-Nasāʾī among others have said: “He is abandoned in narration.”²
- * Al-Ājurri said that he asked Abū Dāwūd regarding him and he said: “He used to fabricate narrations.”³
- * Al-Dāraquṭnī said: “Abandoned.”
- * Al-Sājī, al-‘Uqaylī, Ibn al-Jārūd and Ibn Shāhīn have included him in the category of weak narrators.

Now look at the academic bankruptcy of al-Mālikī by his statement:

... so the correct view regarding him — and Allah knows best — is that he is acceptable in complimentary and corroboratory narrations only, for three reasons:

- i. He was ratified by some of the scholars even though they be few in number...

I say: None of them have ratified him besides Ibn ‘Uqdah, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd ibn ‘Uqdah. Who is this Ibn ‘Uqdah, and what is his rank in the science of adjudication of narrators?

- * Ibn ‘Abdān said: “Ibn ‘Uqdah is beyond the general meaning of the people of ḥadīth, and he should not be mentioned among them.”

1 *al-Ḍuʿafā al-Kabīr* (3/101)

2 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* (6/53)

3 *Lisān al-Mīzān* (2/226)

- * Ḥamzah al-Sahmī said: “I asked Abū Bakr ibn ‘Abdān regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah, if something has been transmitted from him regarding the evaluation of narrators will it be accepted. He responded, ‘it will not be accepted.’”¹
- * Al-Daraqūṭnī said of him: “He was a sinister person.” See also *al-Kāmil* (5/327)
- * Al-Barqānī said: “I asked Al-Dāraqūṭnī what was it that disturbed him most about Ibn ‘Uqdah, he said that it was the abundance of rejected narrations [contradictions by weak narrators].”
- * Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī said in *al-Tanqīḥ*: “He was the gathering point of solitary, rejected weak narrations.”²
- * Al-Dhahabī said in *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (15/142): “He wrote from every young, old, unknown and gathered the lean and the fat — meaning he wrote all sorts of narrations without consideration.” In *Mīzan al-‘Itidāl* (1/128) he said: “Ibn ‘Uqdah and Ibn Kharrāsh have innovation and *Rafḍ* [Shī‘ism].”³

Furthermore, I say that the reason for him being considered weak by the scholars of ḥadīth is because he fabricates narrations, not because of his innovation as al-Mālikī claims from Imām Aḥmad and Abū Ḥatīm al-Rāzī:

- * ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī said: “He used to fabricate narrations.”⁴
- * Al-Ājurri said that he asked Abū Dāwūd regarding him and he said: “He used to fabricate narrations.”⁵

[Continuing with the reasons al-Mālikī cited for accepting these narrations:]

1 *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz* (3/822)

2 *Lisān al-Mīzān* (1/603)

3 See also *al-Tankīl* (1/170)

4 see *al-Kāmil* (5/327)

5 *Lisān al-Mīzān* (2/226)

ii. This narration has only one complimentary narration, it is from those narrations which are fairly acceptable which was addressed by Ibn ‘Adī.

I say, Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (5/328) has said: “Among his narrations are those that are not corroborated,” this is one of them.

iii. Shu‘bah and Qatādah have narrated from him and they are from the foremost scholars.

This is responded to from three angles:

- * Shu‘bah did not narrate from ‘Abd al-Ghaffār ibn al-Qāsim, Abū Maryam, al-Anṣārī, except two narrations. The first narration Shu‘bah narrates from him from Nāfi’ from Ibn ‘Umar, and the other from ‘Aṭā’ from Jābir. Shu‘bah only narrated from him before his situation became apparent. When it became apparent that he forged narrations he abandoned him.
- * Al-Dāraquṭnī said: “Abandoned in ḥadīth, and he is the teacher of Shu‘bah. Shu‘bah praised him, however his situation was concealed from Shu‘bah; and he remained after Shu‘bah and used to confuse narrations.” Abū Dāwūd said, “Shu‘bah erred with regards to him.”¹ Abū Ja‘far al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (3/852) has related from Imām Aḥmad: “Shu‘bah knew him from old, as for what happened to him it came afterwards.”
- * As for Qatādah narrating from him, the opposite is true. He narrates from Qatādah.²

The narration of ‘Āṣim al-Laythī

Al-Ṭabarānī narrates in *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* (17/176):

Al-‘Abbās ibn al-Faḍl al-Asfāṭī narrated to us — he says — Mūsā ibn Ismā‘īl narrated to us and ‘Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Ḥusayn al-‘Ābūrī al-Tusturī

1 See *Lisān al-Mīzān* (2/228), *Su‘ālāt al-Barqānī* (316)

2 *al-Kāmil* (5/328)

— he said — ‘Uqbah ibn Sinān al-Dāri’ — they both said — Ghassān ibn Muḍar narrated to us — from Sa‘īd ibn Yazīd Abū Maslamah — from Naṣr ibn ‘Āṣim al-Laythī — from his father, who said: “I entered the masjid of Madīnah when I suddenly heard people saying, ‘we seek refuge in Allah from the anger of Allah and the anger of His Messenger,’ so I said, ‘what is it?’ they said, “the Messenger of Allah was delivering a sermon on the pulpit when a man stood up, grabbed hold of the hand of his son and exited the masjid. The Messenger ﷺ then said, “may the curse of Allah be on the leader and the one being led, woe unto this nation from so-and-so who has a large rear-end.”

Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim narrates it in *al-Āḥād wa al-Mathānī* (938) in an abridged form, and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Istī‘āb* (575) with similar wording, however there is absolutely no mention of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Some scholars have held the opinion that Abū Naṣr, ‘Āṣim ibn ‘Amr al-Laythi is not a Ṣaḥābī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Istī‘āb* (575) says:

Aḥmad said I am not certain if ‘Āṣim heard this from the Prophet or not.

It appears in *al-Iṣābah* (3/574):

Al-Baghawī said: “I am not certain if he is a companion or not.”

Furthermore, the narration does not expressly mention Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه as the intended individual who was cursed. In addition to this, the text of the narration is rejected and contradictory since it casts impairment on the Prophet ﷺ and all Muslims, if the person who ratifies this narration has any sense.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (4/445) said:

Verily the sermons of the Prophet ﷺ were many. Instead, he delivered numerous sermons on the days of Jumu‘ah, ‘Id, Ḥajj among other occasions. Mu‘āwiyah and his father attended these sermons as did the rest of the

believers. Is it conceivable that they would get up and leave at every such occasion, and were free to do so if they so wished?

This casts serious doubt on the Messenger ﷺ and all the Muslims since they could not prevent two individuals from getting up and leaving the sermon, and if it was indeed the truth that they did attend the sermons, why would they not want to listen to one particular sermon, before it has been spoken?

The Narration of Ibn ‘Umar

It has been narrated by Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim in the book *Ṣifṭīn* (220) by way of Talīd ibn Sulaymān — from al-A‘mash — from ‘Alī ibn al-Aqmar who said:

We visited Mu‘āwiyah as a delegation, and after completing our tasks we said let us try to meet a person who was present during the life of the Messenger ﷺ and saw him; so we came to Ibn ‘Umar... and in it: “the Prophet ﷺ looked at Abū Sufyān, Mu‘āwiyah and his brother, one of them leading the camel, and the other driving it from the back so he - ﷺ - said: ‘O Allah, curse the leader, and the rider, and the driver.’ So we said, “have you heard this from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ?” He said, “Yes, otherwise may my ears become deaf just as my eyes have lost their sight!”

In this narration appears, Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim, the Rāfiḍī [Shī‘a], abandoned in narration and the opinions of the expert scholars have been previously mentioned regarding his weakness.

Talīd ibn Sulaymān, he is al-Muḥāribī, the Kūfan.

- * Abū Ja‘far al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (1/155) said: “Aḥmad and Yaḥya both said that he is a liar!”
- * In another narration from Yaḥya: “Not [worth] anything, he used to utter profanities against ‘Uthmān or one of the other Ṣaḥābah, he is

a Dajjāl.”¹

- * Al-Nasā'ī and al-Dāraqūṭnī both said he is weak.
- * Ibrāhīm said: “According to me he used to lie!”²
- * Sāliḥ Jazarah said: “The people of ḥadīth used to call him “balīd” meaning foolish — instead of talīd, his narrations are not admissible.”
- * Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (2/86) said: “It is clear from his narrations that he is weak.”
- * Al-Sājī said: “Confounded liar!”
- * Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūḥīn* (1/204) said: “He narrated the most strange narrations regarding the virtue of the Noble Household.”
- * Al-Tirmidhī narrated one narration of his under the chapter of merits.
- * Al-Marwazī relates from Aḥmad: “He adopted Shī'ī thought, and there was no harm seen in him.” He also said: “I narrated from him many narrations from Abū al-Jaḥāf.

Perhaps Imām Aḥmad mentioned this before his situation became apparent since it appears in another narration that Imām Aḥmad considered him a liar.

- * Al-‘Ijlī said: “No harm in him, although he adopted Shī'ī thought and he used to evade.”³

As for al-‘Ijlī, he was considered from the scholars who were more lenient in ratifying narrators.

- * Al-Hākim Abū Sa‘īd al-Naqqāsh said: “Foul in terms of his school of thought, very weak in narration, he narrated from Abū al-Jaḥāf many

1 *Tārīkh ibn Ma‘īn* (2/285), (3/546)

2 *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (biography no. 93)

3 *Ma‘rifat al-Thiqāt* (1/257)

fabricated narrations as mentioned in *Tahdhīb al-Taḥthīb* (1/257).”

From this it is clear that he is a liar and fabricator, his weakness is not simply because of his creed but on account of his lying.

So this narration is from a fabricator who relates from a narrator whose narrations are abandoned.

Add to that the fact that Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was the most distant from criticising the Ṣaḥābah, and the one who narrated of their merits in abundance and his praise for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is well-known and established. He said:

I have not seen a more skilled governor after the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیہ وسلم than Mu‘āwiyah. It was said to him, “What about Abū Bakr and ‘Umar?” He responded, “they were better than him, however, I have not seen a more skilled governor than Mu‘āwiyah.”¹

Narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/173) and al-Lālakā’i in *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* (2781) and al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (1/443). It is also supported by what has been narrated by al-Bukharī in *Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (7/327) and (2/442), Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (6/110), Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/174) by way of Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar, see also *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/153) therefore it is sound.

The Narration of Muhājir ibn Qunfudh

Al-Mālikī said:

The *Musnad* of Muhājir is in those sections of the *Mu‘jam* of al-Ṭabarānī that have been lost. Therefore, I cannot give a ruling on the chain. However, this chain is a complimentary chain that strengthens the original narration, especially with the ratification of al-Haythamī.²

1 See *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (4/445)

2 Pg. 202 of his book *al-Suḥbah wal-Saḥābah*

I say: in *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī (20/230) he says:

Al-Miqdām ibn Dāwūd narrated to us — he said — Asad ibn Mūsā narrated to us — he said — Abū Mu'āwiyah Muḥammad ibn Kāzim narrated to us — from Ismā'īl ibn Muslim — from Ḥasan — from Muhājir ibn Qunfudh — who said that the Messenger ﷺ saw three people on a camel and said, “the third is accursed.”

In *Mu'jam al-Sahabah* (3/60), Ḥasan ibn 'Ali al-'Anzī said that Abū Kurayb narrated to us from Abū Mu'āwiyah with the same narration. This chain has two defects:

- a. Ismā'īl ibn Muslim al-Makkī is abandoned in narration.
- b. Al-Ḥasan ibn Abī al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī did not hear from Muhajir ibn Qunfudh, instead he narrated it via Huḍayn ibn al-Mundhir al-Qurashī.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah, in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/445), said:

Firstly, we call for establishing the authenticity of the narration before using it as proof. And we only say this from the position of debating it, otherwise we are fully convinced that this is a lie. Secondly, this narration is a fabrication and a lie according to the unanimous view of the scholars of ḥadīth... — until he goes on to say — thereafter, it is well-known from the biography of Mu'āwiyah that he was a very tolerant and patient person, even with those who sought to harm him. How is it that he would be turned away from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ while he — ﷺ — is the most lofty in status from all of creation in this world and the next, and Mu'āwiyah is in need of him for all his affairs? How is it possible that Mu'āwiyah cannot bear to hear his speech? After having established his rule, he even tolerated those who swore him on his face. Why then should he not listen to the Messenger ﷺ? Thereafter, how is it possible that the Prophet ﷺ took him as a scribe if he was aware of all of this?

1 See *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (28/578)

The Third Narration

There shall enter upon you, from this mountain pass, a man who will die upon other than my religion.¹

Al-Balādhurī said in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (126):

Bakr ibn al-Haytham said that ‘Abd al-Razzāq narrated to us — he said — Mā‘mar narrated to us from, Ibn Tāwūs — from his father — from Kaysān — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-Āṣ — who said: “I was sitting with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ when he said, ‘there shall enter upon you, from this mountain pass, a man who will die upon other than my religion,’ and I had left my father after the water for wuḍū’ had been placed for him — so I was like a person who was holding back his urge to urinate, out of fear that my father would come. Then Mu‘āwiyah came and the Messenger ﷺ said, “this is he.”

Al-Ṭabarānī has narrated a similar narration without the mention of Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه.

Al-Haythamī has said in *Majma‘ al-Zawa‘id* (5/243):

It has been narrated entirely by al-Ṭabarānī, and in the chain is Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah, his narrations are generally fine however he has some weakness that is not apparent, and the remainder of the narrators are the narrators of the authentic collections.

1 Al-Ṭabarī has mentioned in his *Tārīkh* (5/618) from the incidents that occurred in the year 248 A.H, that on the 11th day of that year, a Friday, people said that al-Mu‘taḍid instructed that a book be taken out, which al-Ma‘mūn had ordered be compiled with curses against Mu‘āwiyah. This was to be read from the pulpits. In this book it is alleged that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “There shall enter upon you a man, from my community, from this mountain pass, who will die on something other than my religion,” and Mu‘āwiyah emerged. Also, the alleged statement: “If you see Mu‘āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him!” as well as: “May the curse of Allah be on the leader, the rider, and the driver” and other types of profanities which a Muslim will be too ashamed of mentioning.

Imām Aḥmad pointed out a defect in this narration with the wording, “a man shall enter upon you from the inmates of the Fire...” it is similar to the meaning of the first narration in *al-Muntakhab min al-‘ilal*, al-Khallāl said (228):

I asked Aḥmad regarding the narration of Sharīk, from Layth, from Tāwūs from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar, who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said. “there shall enter upon you a man from the inmates of the Fire,” and then Mu‘āwiyah entered. He said, “in fact it is from Ibn Tāwūs, from his father, from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr or someone other than him, he was uncertain.”

Al-Khallāl said:

‘Abd al-Razzāq narrated it from Ma‘mar, from Ibn Tāwūs, who said, “I heard al-Farkhāsh¹ narrating this narration from my father, from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr.”

Al-Bukharī pointed out the flaw in this narration in *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (71), he said:

It is narrated from Ma‘mar, from Ibn Tāwūs, from his father, from a man, from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr, from the Messenger ﷺ regarding this incident. However, this chain is interrupted, not to be relied upon.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/444), said:

This narration is a fabricated lie according to the unanimous opinion of the people of knowledge of ḥadīth.

In addition to this, Bakr ibn Haytham, the teacher of al-Balādhurī, I could not find any biographical details for him.

1 This is how it appears in the original text, but it seems to be an error. Perhaps the correct wording would be: ‘I heard al-Layth narrating...’

As for the narration of Iṣḥāq, who narrates this jointly, he is Iṣḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Dabarī al-Ṣanʿānī, not — as al-Mālikī claims — Iṣḥāq ibn Isrāʾīl, since Iṣḥāq ibn Isrāʾīl, even though he is from the teachers of al-Balādhurī, he is not known to have narrated from ʿAbd al-Razzāq as opposed to Iṣḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Dabarī.

Ibn ʿAdī has mentioned in *al-Kāmil* (1/344):

Iṣḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAbbād, Abū Yaʿqūb, al-Dabarī al-Ṣanʿānī, said, “ʿAbd al-Razzāq considered me too young.” His father brought him into the gathering [of ʿAbd al-Razzāq] when he was very young. He used to say, “we read to ʿAbd al-Razzāq.” Actually, others read since he was very small. He narrated uncorroborated narrations [contradicting the reliable narrations] from ʿAbd al-Razzāq.

Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī in *Sharḥ ʿilal al-Tirmidhī* (2/581) has quoted Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī saying: “ʿAbd al-Razzāq passed away when al-Dabarī was six or seven years old.”

I say that ʿAbd al-Razzāq was reliable, an expert, except that his memory faltered towards the end of his life. Therefore, the narration of the later students is not on par with the narrations of those who narrated from him early on. As for al-Dabarī, he only heard during the latter portion, after ʿAbd al-Razzāq lost his eyesight and his memory faltered. In addition to this, ʿAbd al-Razzāq has narrated a number of objectionable narrations [which contradict the reliable] on the virtues of the Noble Household, and regarding the shortcomings of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Ibn ʿAdī, in *al-Kāmil* (1/344), has said: “They have attributed to him Shīʿī leanings, and he has narrated on the virtues of the Noble Household, which have not been concurred by other. And, this is the greatest thing that he has been criticised with; his narration of these narrations as well as that which he narrated in the flaws of others of which I am not going to mention. As for his honesty, I certainly consider no harm in him except those few narrations on the virtues of the Noble Household, and the flaws of others which are objectionable [on the basis of contradicting reports of higher authenticity],” this is an unequivocal statement

by Ibn ‘Adī that he — ‘Abd al-Razzāq — has narrations of virtues and demerits which are not valid.

Ibn Rajab, in *Sharḥ ‘ilal al-Tirmidhī* (2/580), said: “... and more than one have mentioned of ‘Abd al-Razzāq that he has narrated objectionable narrations on the virtues of ‘Alī and the Noble Household. Perhaps these narrations have been fed to him after he lost his sight, as Imām Aḥmad has said, and Allah knows best. As for some of these narrations, they are narrated by weak narrators from him and therefore are not correctly attributed to him.”

Al-Dhahabī has said of Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Dabarī: “Ibn ‘Adī considered him too young to narrate from ‘Abd al-Razzāq. My opinion is that he did hear from ‘Abd al-Razzāq, he wrote it down when he was approximately seven years old, and he relates from him many objectionable narrations, so uncertainty arose whether these objectionable narrations were the lone narrations of al-Dabarī from ‘Abd al-Razzāq, or whether they they the lone narrations of ‘Abd al-Razzāq. Some of the scholars, like Abū ‘Awānah, have relied on his narrations.”¹

Ibn al-Salāḥ, in his *Muqaddimah* (355), said: “I have found some narrations, which al-Ṭabarānī relates from al-Dabarī, which were highly objectionable. So I considered it due to that reason [mentioned earlier].”

Corroboration of This Narration Through Another Chain

- I. This report has been corroborated by that which has been narrated by Abū Nu‘aym in *Tārīkh Isfahān* (2/77), by way of the narration of al-Layth — from Tāwūs — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr: “The Prophet ﷺ said, ‘there shall come from Yathrib, a man who will die on other than my religion.’ I thought it to be my father as I lift him while he was getting ready, when suddenly so-and-so came.”
- II. It has also been related by al-Balādhurī in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (5/134) by way of Sharīk — from Tāwūs — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr with a similar meaning.

¹ *Al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu‘afā’* (1/69)

In the first chain appears Layth ibn Abī Sulaym ibn Zunaym, al-Qurashī (through allegiance), Abū Bakr. It is also said Abū Bakr al-Kūfī.

- * ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad, relates from his father: “Irreconcilable disorder in his narration, however some have narrated from him.”¹
- * Ibn Ma‘īn² said of him: “Weak. Although, his narrations may be recorded.”
- * Yaḥya ibn Sa‘īd did not narrate from him, and Ibn ‘Uyaynah considered weak the narrations of Layth ibn Abī Sulaym.
- * Ibn Abī Ḥātim said: “I heard my father and Abū Zur‘ah saying, ‘Layth ibn Abī Sulaym is fairly weak, his narrations are not independently authoritative according to the scholars of ḥadīth.’”³
- * Ibn ‘Adī, in *al-Kāmil* (6/89), said: “He has some narrations that are acceptable, and Shu‘bah and al-Thowrī narrated from him. With his weakness, his narrations may be recorded.”
- * Ibn Sa‘d has said: “He has a man of righteousness and worship, he was weak as a narrator. It is said he would ask ‘Aṭā’, Tāwūs and Mujāhid about something and they would differ. However, he would — unintentionally — narrate it as though they were in agreement.”⁴
- * Ibn Ḥibbān, in *al-Majrūḥīn* (2/237), said: “His memory failed him towards the end of his life, he would switch the chains, and connect the interrupted chains, and relate from the reliable narrators that which has not been narrated by them. Al-Qaṭṭān abandoned him [his narrations], as well as Ibn Mahdi, Ibn Ma‘īn, and Aḥmad.”
- * Al-Tirmidhī said: “Muḥammad said that Aḥmad would say of Layth that

1 *al-Du‘afā’ al-Kabīr* (4/16)

2 *Tārīkh ibn Ma‘īn* narration of al-Dūrī (1/158)

3 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (7/178)

4 *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* (6/349)

his narrations were not pleasing. Muḥammad said that Layth is truthful, but makes mistakes”¹

- * Al-Hākim Abū Aḥmad said: “He is not strong according to them.”
- * Al-Hākim Abū ‘Abd Allāh said: “It’s unanimous among them that he has a weak memory.”
- * Al-Jūzajānī said: “His narrations are considered weak.”²

In the second chain is Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī, and his details have been mentioned previously as well as Layth.

This Narration has Complimentary Narrations as Well

Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim has narrated in *Ṣiffīn* (217), by way of Ja‘far ibn Ziyād al-Aḥmar — from Layth — from Mujāhid — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr.

Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim has narrated in *Ṣiffīn* (219), by way of Sharīk — from Layth — from Tāwūs — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr — from the Prophet ﷺ, with the wording ... “a man shall die, and when he dies it will be on other than my religion.”

Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim has narrated in *Ṣiffīn* (217), by way of Ja‘far ibn Ziyād al-Aḥmar — from Layth — from Muḥārib ibn Dithār — from Jābir — from the Prophet ﷺ, with the wording: “Mu‘āwiyah shall die on other than my religion.”

All these complimentary narrations are from the narrations of Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim, a Rāfiḍī, abandoned in narration, the details of his weakness have been previously mentioned, as well as that of Layth ibn Abī Sulaym who had a weak memory.

As for the second of these narrations, appearing in the chain is Sharīk al-Qāḍī, whose memory was considered weak, especially in that which he narrated after assuming the post in the judiciary.

1 *al-‘ilal al-Kabīr* (293), *al-Tahdhīb* (8/418)

2 *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (biography 91)

How beautiful are the words of Ibn Taymiyyah in his (4/472):

It has been established through recurrence in reports that Mu'āwiyah had been instructed by the Prophet ﷺ as a scribe for recording revelation. Thereafter he was appointed by 'Umar, who was the most acquainted person in assessing men and upon whose tongue and heart Allah voiced the truth, to govern and 'Umar had no doubts about him in giving him that jurisdiction. During his lifetime, the Prophet ﷺ mandated the father of Mu'āwiyah, Abū Sufyān, with governing and this continued until the demise of the Prophet ﷺ. Mu'āwiyah is superior to his father, and of a higher rank in Islam, so if his father had been mandated to govern, he is more deserving of that than his father. He was not of the renegades or the apostates after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ, and none of the scholars ascribed any of this to him. As to those who ascribe this to him, they do the same of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, most of the participants of Badr, the people who swore the Allegiance of al-Riḍwān, and others besides them from the earliest of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and those who followed him with excellence.

In his *Fatāwā* (4/476) he said:

As to those who say that the faith of Mu'āwiyah was hypocrisy, then that is also a forgery and lie. None of the scholars among the Muslims have accused Mu'āwiyah with hypocrisy, in fact they are in agreement with the excellence of his Islam. Although, some of them had reservations about the Islam of his father, Abū Sufyān, they all agree to the excellence of the Islam of Mu'āwiyah, and his brother Yazīd, just as they do not disagree with regards to the excellence of Islam of 'Ikrimah ibn Abī Jahl, Suhayl ibn 'Amr, Ṣafwān ibn Umayyah and their likes from those who accepted Islam on the Conquest of Makkah.

How does a man who governs the Muslims for forty years, both as a representative and as an independent ruler, and he leads them in their five daily prayers, delivers sermons, admonishes them, advises them

with righteousness, forbids them from evil, establishes the penal code, distributes the booty and charities among them, and he undertakes the pilgrimage with them; how is it possible that he hid his hypocrisy from them? Add to that the presence of senior Ṣaḥābah during that era?

In fact greater than this — and all praise belongs to Allah — is the fact that none of the Caliphs who had general jurisdiction, from the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphs was ever accused of heresy or hypocrisy, although some individuals among them were accused of innovation and oppression. Yet none of the scholars ever accused them of heresy or hypocrisy, as to those who were accused of this, they were from the semi-autonomous kingdoms living under their jurisdiction like the Būyids and others. As for the general rulers, Allah has sanctified the believers from setting upon them a ruler who was a heretic or hypocrite, and this is worthy of being known and is beneficial in this regard. The scholars are unanimous that Mu‘āwiyah was the best sovereign of this ummah, since the four before him were prophetic Caliphs, he was the first of the sovereigns whose reign was one of mercy.

He also said (35/62):

... and Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, and their likes are from the believers. None of the earliest generation of Muslims accused them of hypocrisy.

In the *Masā’il* of Ibn Hānī al-Naysapūrī (408) it appears:

I heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh, Aḥmad saying that Dullūyah said to him that he heard ‘Alī ibn al-Ja’d saying: “I swear by Allah that Mu‘āwiyah died on other than Islam.”

This is Responded to in the following manner

‘Alī ibn al-Ja’d, he is ‘Alī ibn ‘Ubayd ibn al-Ja’d al-Jowharī, an Imām, and an authority, from the teachers of al-Bukhārī. However, he would accuse ‘Uthmān

and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, infact he would reject narrations which proved the preference of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān above the rest of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. To the extent that he would reject the narration which praises Ḥasan رضي الله عنه: "This son of mine is a sayyid."

Hārūn ibn Sufyān al-Mustamlī said: "I was with 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd once when 'Uthmān was mentioned, to which he remarked, 'he took one hundred thousand dirhams from the public treasury without rightful cause,' upon which I responded, 'by Allah, he only took it with rightful cause.'"¹

Abū Dāwūd says: "Amr ibn Marzūq is preferred to me over 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd. 'Alī was branded with an evil branding-rod and used to say, 'it does not affect me that Mu'āwiyah be punished.'"²

Abū Yaḥya al-Nāqid said: "I heard Abū Ghassān al-Dūrī saying I was present with 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd when the narration of Ibn 'Umar was mentioned, 'we would prefer during the era of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and we used to say, 'the best of this ummah after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم is Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān,' and this reached the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and he would not object," to which 'Alī [ibn al-Ja'd] said: "Look at this immature youngster who does not even know how to properly divorce his wife yet he says, "we used to prefer..." so the ḥadīth regarding Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, "this son of mine is a sayyid..." was mentioned, to which he responded, "Allah has not made him a sayyid."³

So the Rāfiḍah and their ilk, if they wish to accept the statement of 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, they ought to accept what he says about Ḥasan رضي الله عنه as well.

As for Ahl al-Sunnah, this ḥadīth is mentioned in their *Sīḥāh*, *Sunan* and *Musnad*

1 *Tārīkh Baghdād* (11/364), *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (biography 4623)

2 *Ibid*

3 *Ibid*, *Al-'Uqaylī in al-Ḍu'afā'* (3/945)

collections, and their response regarding what has been quoted of Ibn al-Ja'd is as mentioned by al-Dhahabī in *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* (10/464):

Perhaps Ibn al-Ja'd has repented from this predicament. Allah has made him a sayyid despite whatever any ignoramus has to say. Indeed one who persists on matters like these by rejecting that which the best of mankind ﷺ has said, such a person becomes a heretic without any hesitation. What leadership and nobility can compare to one who is sworn as the khalīfah, then relinquishes it to his relative, and swears allegiance to him on condition that he becomes the sworn incumbent and that the affairs of state will be entrusted with Mu'āwiyah to eliminate the fitnah, and to preserve human blood, and to reconcile between the armies of the ummah, so that they may concentrate on fighting the real enemies and be free of infighting. The insight of the Prophet ﷺ regarding him was certainly correct and that is considered from his miracles, by way of predicting future events. Thereby displaying the nobility of Ḥasan ibn 'Alī رضي الله عنه, the dear, beloved grandson of Allah's Messenger ﷺ.

This same 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd from whom it is claimed that he considered Mu'āwiyah one who died on something other than Islam, he narrates ḥadīth from Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه in his *Musnad* as well!

So either it is not correctly established from him, the unwarranted comments regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, or he repented from such comments. Otherwise, how does one explain the fact that he swears on the disbelief of an individuals then include that persons narration in his *Musnad*?!

Imām Aḥmad has criticised 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd on account of his unwarranted comments on the Ṣaḥābah, May Allah be pleased with them all. Imām Aḥmad drew a line across all the narrations that he collected by way of 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd.

Abū Ja'far al-'Uqaylī said: "I asked 'Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad why he did not narrate from 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd and he responded that his father prohibited him from going to 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd as it had reached him that 'Alī ibn Ja'd spoke unfavourably of the

Ṣaḥābah.”¹

Abū Zur‘ah said: “Aḥmad did not see it appropriate to narrate from ‘Alī ibn al-Ja‘d and Sa‘īd ibn Sulaymān, and I had seen in his books the marks striking out their narrations.”²

The Fourth Narration

The first to change my Sunnah is a man from Banū Umayyah.

It has been narrated by Ibn Abī Shaybah in *al-Muṣannaf* (35866), Ibn Abī ‘Aṣīm (63), Abū Nu‘aym in *Tārīkh Isfahān* (1/1320), Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (3/164), al-Bayhaqī in *Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* (6/466), Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (18/160), all of them by way of the narration of Abū al-‘Āliyah — from Abū Dharr رضي الله عنه, who said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and mentioned the report...” and in some versions of this narration as mentioned by al-Bukharī in *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (158): Abū al-‘Āliyah said, “we were with Abū Dharr in al-Shām [Greater Syria],” and in it is an incident regarding Abū Dharr and Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه.

This Narration Has Two Defects

1. Abū Dharr did not come to al-Shām during the era of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, he only came during the era of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah passed away during the era of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. So how is it possible for Abū al-‘Āliyah to hear a narration from Abū Dharr in al-Shām, when Abū Dharr did not come to Shām during the era of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه?

Al-Bukharī, in *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (158) said:

Muḥammad narrated to me – he said – ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ibn ‘Abd al-Majīd narrated to me from al-Muhājir ibn Makhlad – he said – Abū al-‘Āliyah

1 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (biography 4623), Al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (3/945)

2 *Ibid*

narrated to me and said — Abū Muslim narrated to me and said: “Abū Dharr was in al-Shām, and governing it was Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān, so the people engaged in a battle and brought back booty.” However, what is known is that Abū Dharr was in al-Shām during the era of ‘Uthmān, and governing it was Mu‘āwiyah. Yazīd passed away during the era of ‘Umar and it is not known that Abū Dharr journeyed to al-Shām during the era of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.

2. Abū al-‘Āliyah, Rāfi‘ ibn Mihrān al-Rayāḥī did not hear from Abū Dharr [directly]. The chain is therefore interrupted and it does not have any other chains to corroborate it.

- * Al-Dūrī said: “I asked Ibn Ma‘īn if Abū al-‘Āliyah heard from Abū Dharr, he said, ‘no, instead he narrates via Abū Muslim, from him,’ I asked who this Abū Muslim is and he said, ‘I do not know.’”¹
- * This narration has also appeared via Abū al-‘Āliyah, from Abū Muslim, from Abū Dharr as related by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (65/250), and this Abū Muslim is unknown to Ibn Ma‘īn as mentioned previously.
- * Al-Bukharī considered this narration defective as mentioned in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/649).
- * Al-Bayhaqī, in *al-Dalā’il* (6/468), said: “This chain is interrupted between Abū al-‘Āliyah and Abū Dharr.”
- * In *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/649), Ibn Kathīr mentioned: “This is from the weak and interrupted narrations in defamation of Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān.”²

This is because it is from the narration of Abul ‘Āliyah from Abū Ḥarr, and he did not hear it from him, and the link between them, Abū Muslim is unknown.

1 *Tārīkh ibn Ma‘īn* narration of al-Dūrī (4/120)

2 See also *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (9/234)

Supposing the authenticity of this narration, then it is in reference to Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah since al-Rūyānī has narrated in his *Musnad* as mentioned in *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (1/329) via the narration of Muhājir ibn Makhlad, from Abū al-‘Āliyah, from Abū Dharr رضي الله عنه who said:

I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم say: “The first to change my Sunnah will be a man from Banū Umayyah called Yazīd.”

This is the same chain that has been authenticated by those who authenticate this narration. Therefore, Ibn ‘Adī, in *al-Kāmil* (3/164) said: “And in some reports with additional explanation, “he is called Yazīd.”¹

Al-Bayhaqī, in *Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* (6/467), has mentioned: “It seems possible that this person could be Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.”

The Fifth Narration

I have been commanded to kill those who are disloyal, those who are unjust, and those who defect.

This narration has been narrated via numerous chains, from ‘Alī, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, ‘Ammār, Ibn Mas‘ūd, and Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī — may Allah be pleased with them all — and all the variant chains of this narration are not reliable.²

The First Chain

Narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/480) by way of Abū al-Jārūd — from

1 Al-Munāwī has stated in *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* (3/94): “Al-Bayhaqī has said in his comments on this narration that it refers to Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah due to the report of Abū Ya‘lā, al-Bayhaqī, Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn Ma‘īn: “The affair of my ummah will remain upon justice until the first who will dent it, a man from Banū Umayyah; he is called Yazīd”

2 I say: all the chains, combined, still do not lend strength to this narration. Imām ibn ‘Abd al-Hādī said in *al-Ṣārim al-Mankī* (51): “How many a narration that has numerous chains yet the scholars of this discipline have stated that it is weak, inadmissible as proof, and they are in agreement of its non-acceptance.”

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn — from his father — from his grandfather.

- * Abū al-Jārūd, he is Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir al-Hamadanī al-Kūfī al-A‘mā [the Kūfan, the blind one], and to him the Jārūdiyyah¹ are attributed.
- * Abū Ḥātim considered him exceptionally weak. He said: “Abandoned in narration.”²
- * Al-Bukhārī said: “They speak [negatively] of him.”³
- * Al-Nasā’ī said: “Abandoned.”
- * Ibn Ma‘īn said: “Confounded liar.”⁴
- * Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūhīn* (1/306) said: “He fabricates narrations regarding virtues and flaws.”

The Second Chain

Narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/470) by way of Ja‘far al-Aḥmar — from Yūnus ibn al-Arḡam — from Abān — from Khulayd al-‘Asarī who said: “I heard Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī...” and he mentioned the narration.

- * In this chain appears Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh, Abū Ismā‘īl al-Baṣrī.
- * Abandoned in narration as expressed by Aḥmad, Ibn Ma‘īn, and al-Nasā’ī.⁵
- * Ibn ‘Adī, in *al-Kāmil* (1/381), quotes Shu‘bah: “It is more preferable for me to drink the urine of a donkey until my satiation, than to say Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh narrated to me.”

1 The Jārūdiyyah branch of the Zaydī Shī‘āh. ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Baghdādī said in *al-Farq Bayna al-Firaq* (39): “To consider them infidel is obligatory since they consider the Ṣaḥābah infidels.”

2 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (3/371)

3 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (3/471)

4 *Tārīkh ibn Ma‘īn* (3/456)

5 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* (14)

The Third Chain

It has been narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/469) via ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī — from Anas ibn ‘Amr — from his father — from ‘Alī.

- * Ibn Kharrāsh said: “Anas ibn ‘Amr — from his father — from ‘Alī, unknown.”¹
- * ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī, he is ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn ‘Abbās al-Shibāmī al-Kūfī.
- * Al-Dhahabī said in *Mīzan al-ʿItidāl* (3/533): “Abū Nu‘aym said about him that there was no one in Kūfah who was a greater liar than him.”

The Fourth Chain

It has been narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/469) via Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan — from ‘Aṭīyyah ibn Sa’d al-ʿAwfī — he said — my father narrated to me — he said — ‘Amr ibn ‘Aṭīyyah narrated to me — from his brother, Ḥasan ibn ‘Aṭīyyah ibn Sa’d — from Ibn ‘Aṭīyyah — he said — my grandfather, Sa’īd ibn Junādah, narrated to me, from ‘Alī عليه السلام.

This is a successive chain of weak narrators, ‘Aṭīyyah al-ʿAwfī and those after him are all weak narrators.

Ibn Rajab said in his *Sharḥ ʿilal al-Tirmidhī* (2/884): “From those households that were all weak was the household of ‘Aṭīyyah al-ʿAwfī and his children.”

The Fifth Chain

It has been narrated by Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim in *al-Sunnah* (939), al-Bazzār (3270) as it appears in *Kashf al-Astār*, and by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/469) via the narration of Fiṭr ibn Khalīfah, from Ḥakīm ibn Jubayr, from Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī, from ‘Alqamah who said that he heard ‘Alī ibn Abi Ṭālib saying on the Day of

¹ *al-Mīzān* (1/277)

Nahrawān: “I have been instructed with killing those who defect, and these are the defectors.”

In this chain appears Ḥakīm ibn Jubayr.

- * Imām Aḥmad said of him: “Weak. Inconsistent in narration.”¹
- * Al-Nasā’ī said of him: “Weak. A Kūfan.”²
- * Al-Dāraquṭnī said of him: “Abandoned.”
- * Al-Jūzajānī said of him: “A confounded liar.”³

The Sixth Chain

It is narrated by al-Bazzār (774), Abū Ya’lā in his *Musnad* (519), and al-‘Uqaylī in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (2/404) via the narration of al-Rabī ibn Sahl al-Fazārī, from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Ubayd, from ‘Alī ibn Rabī‘ah al-Wālibī, from ‘Alī عليه السلام.

Appearing in this chain is al-Rabī ibn Sahl ibn Dukayn al-Fazārī.

- * Ibn Ma‘īn said of him: “He is not [worth] anything.”
- * Abū Zur‘ah said of him: “Rejected in narration.”⁴
- * Al-Bukhārī said of him: “He is contradicted in his narrations.”⁵

The Seventh Chain

It is narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (4326), via the narration of Yaḥya ibn Salamah ibn Kuhayl — from his father — from Abū Ṣādiq — from Rabī‘ah ibn Nājidh — from ‘Alī عليه السلام a similar narration.

1 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ al-Kabīr* (1/316)

2 *al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa al-Matrūkīn* (30)

3 *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (biography no.21)

4 *al-Ḍu‘afā’* by al-‘Uqaylī (2/403)

5 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (3/278)

No one has related this from Rabī'ah ibn Nājidh besides Salamah, he is the sole narrator from him.

The Eighth Chain

It is narrated by Ibn 'Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/471), via the narration of Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Azdī — from Abū Hārūn al-'Abdī — from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī.

Appearing in this chain is Abū Hārūn al-'Abdī, 'Umārah ibn Juwayn.

- * Ḥammad ibn Zayd considered him a liar.
- * Aḥmad said: “Not [worth] anything.”
- * Al-Nasā'ī said: “Abandoned in narration.”¹
- * Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūhīn* (2/177), said: “He would narrate from Abū Sa'īd that which was not of his – Abū Sa'īd's – narration.”

The Ninth Chain

It has been narrated by Abū Ya'lā in his *Musnad* (1623) via the narration of al-Qāsim ibn Sulaymān — from his father — from his grandfather — from 'Ammār.

Al-Haythamī, in *Majma' al-Zawā'id* (7/239), said: “Abū Ya'lā has narrated it with a weak chain.”

Al-'Uqaylī said: “Al-Qāsim ibn Sulaymān — from his father — from his grandfather — from 'Ammār regarding fighting the unjust; his narration is not correct.”²

The Tenth Chain

It is narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (4327), via the narration of Muslim ibn Kaysān al-Mulā'ī, from Ibrāhīm, from 'Alqamah, from Ibn Mas'ūd.

1 *al-Kāmil* (5/78)

2 *Mīzan al-'itidāl* (3/371)

This narration is defective due to the appearance of Muslim ibn Kaysān al-Mulāṭī in this chain, and he is weak.¹

He has been contradicted by Ḥasan ibn ‘Amr al-Fuqaymī, since he has narrated it from Ibrāhīm, from ‘Alqamah, from ‘Alī عليه السلام.

Al-Dāraquṭnī said in *al-‘ilal* (1/149): “Some have narrated it with an interrupted chain, and that is the most correct version, from Ibrāhīm, from ‘Alī with an interrupted chain.”

Al-Haythamī, in *Majma‘ al-Zawā'id* (6/235), said: “Narrated by al-Ṭabarānī, and in the chain is someone whom I do not know.”

Muslim ibn Kaysān al-Mulāṭī has been corroborated by Maṣṣūr ibn al-Mu‘tamir as it is mentioned by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/470). However it is a defective corroboration since this chain has one Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abbād al-Muqrī.

- * Al-Dāraquṭnī said of him: “Aabandoned.”
- * Abū Ja‘far al-‘Uqaylī, in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (1/85), said of him: “His narrations do not conform to what has been narrated by reliable narrators.”
- * Ibn Ḥibbān, in *al-Majrūhīn* (1/123), said of him: “It is not permissible to consider him admissible by any condition.”

The Eleventh Chain

It is narrated by al-Ḥākim in *al-Mustadrak* (4674) via the narration of Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd – he said – Salamah ibn al-Faḍl narrated to us – he said – Abū Zayd al-Aḥwal narrated to me from ‘Iqāb ibn Tha‘labah – he said – Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī عليه السلام narrated to me during the era of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattāb عليه السلام: “The Messenger of Allah instructed ‘Alī عليه السلام with killing those who are disloyal, and those who are unjust and those who defect.”

1 See *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (7/271), *al-Jarḥ wal Ta’dīl* (8/193), *al-Kāmil* (6/306)

The Twelfth Chain

Also narrated by al-Ḥākim in *al-Mustadrak* (4675), via the narration of Muḥammad ibn Yūnūs al-Qurashī — from ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Khaṭṭāb — he said — ‘Alī ibn Ghurāb narrated to me — from Ibn Abī Fāṭimah — from al-Aṣḥabī ibn Nabātah — from Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه with a similar meaning.

Both these narrations are not correct.

- * Al-Dhahabī said: ‘It is not correct.’
- * Al-Ḥākim has narrated them with two different weak chains to Abū Ayyūb.

The Thirteenth Chain

Appearing in this chain is Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd al-Rāzī who is weak.

Salamah ibn al-Faḍl, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, al-Abrash, he is weak. He has many contradictions and solitary narrations. As for that which he narrates from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq under the genre of Maghāzī only, it is stronger than the rest even though a general status of weak is accorded to his narrations. There was previous mention of him.

As for ‘Iqab ibn Tha‘labah, Al-Dhahabī has said of him in *Mīzan al-‘itidāl* (4/127): “Abū Zayd al-Aḥwal has narrated from him the narration of killing those who are disloyal, the chain is appalling and the text is rejected.”

The Fourteenth Chain

In this chain appears Muḥammad ibn Yūnus al-Qurashī al-Kudaymī al-Baṣrī, a liar and fabricator.

- * Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Majrūhīn* (2/313) said about him: “Perhaps he has fabricated over a thousand narrations.”
- * Ibn ‘Adī said of him: “He has been accused of fabrication.”

* Aṣḥbagh ibn Nubātah is abandoned in narration.

Ibn Abī Fātimah is ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥuzawwar

* Al-Bukhārī said about him: “There is an issue with him.”¹

* Abū Ḥātim said of him: “Rejected in narration.”²

* Al-Nasā’ī said: “Abandoned.”³

The Fifteenth Chain

It is narrated by Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (2/187), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr* (4/172), and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/473) via the narration of Muḥammad ibn Kathīr, from al-Hārith ibn Haṣīrah, from Abū Sādiq, from Miḥnaf ibn Sulaym, who said: “We went to Abū Ayyūb al-Ansārī and he was feeding a horse of his at Ṣiffīn, at that instance we said to him, ‘O Abū Ayyūb, you fought the polytheists with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, now you have come to fight the believers.’ He said, ‘on behalf of the Messenger ﷺ, as he instructed me to kill three: those who are disloyal, those who are unjust, those who defect. I have fought those who were disloyal and I have also fought with those who were unjust. I will fight — with Allah’s will — the defectors ...’”

In this chain appears Muḥammad ibn Kathīr al-Qurashī al-Kūfī.

* Aḥmad said of him: “We tore up [what we had written of] his narration.”

* Al-Bukhārī said of him: “A Kūfan, rejected in narration.”⁴

* Ibn al-Madīnī said of him: “We recorded from him many absurd narrations, I drew lines over [what I had written of] his narration.”⁵

1 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (6/292), there will be a further discussion regarding this expression later on by the permission of Allah.

2 *al-Jarḥ wal Ta’dīl* (6/183)

3 *al-Tahdhīb* (3/743)

4 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (1/217)

5 *al-Tahdhīb* (3/683)

The Sixteenth Chain

It is narrated by al-Khatīb in his *Tārīkh* (12/186) and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/472) via the narration of al-Mu‘allā ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān — he said — Sharīk narrated to us from al-A‘mash — he said — Ibrahīm narrated to us from ‘Alqamah and al-Aswad — they both said: “We came to Abū Ayyūb...”

In this chain appears al-Mu‘allā ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Wāsiṭī, he fabricates narrations. At the time of his death he clearly stated that he fabricated seventy narrations on the virtues of ‘Alī عليه السلام.¹

As for Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī, he had a weak memory, especially in what he narrated after assuming the post in the judiciary.

Abū Ja‘far al-‘Uqaylī, in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (2/51), said: “The chains of narration from ‘Alī عليه السلام are weak, but the narration from him regarding ‘al-Ḥarūriyyah’ is authentic.” He states further that there is nothing reliable narrated of this nature.

Ibn al-Jowzī has mentioned in *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (2/12): “This narration is, without a doubt, a fabrication!”

Ibn Taymiyyah states in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (6/112): “As for the narration regarding killing those who are disloyal, those who are unjust, and those who defect, it is a complete fabrication and lie against the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم.”

Al-Dhahabī says in *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (2/410): “This is a dubious narration.” He says in *al-Mīzān* (4/127): “The text is rejected.” And in the summary of *al-Mowḍū‘āt* (141) after mentioning this narration: “It has not been narrated of any of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in abundance, regarding their virtues, as of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. However, they are of three kinds: a) Authentic, b) sound and c) weak, dubious; and how many there are like this as well as the baseless fabricated narrations which are in such abundance and some of them lead to heresy; may allah destroy

1 *al-Tahdhīb* (4/122)

those who invented them. And most of these narrations [of virtues of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه] are of this third kind.”

The Sixth Narration

Indeed the killer of ‘Ammār and his marauder are in the fire.

Ibn Taymiyyah has said: “Whoever is pleased with the murder of ‘Ammār, the ruling regarding him is like the ruling on the killer of ‘Ammār.”¹

These statements have numerous glaring errors and are blatant misrepresentations of the truth.

Firstly, the Narration Cannot be Correctly Established

Our teacher, Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Sa’d has explained this in an exceptional manner in his introductory comments on the book *al-Ibānah limā lī al-Ṣaḥābah min al-Manzilah wa al-Makānah* [The exposition regarding what the Ṣaḥābah hold in terms of status and rank] (pg.48), he states:

Aḥmad (4/198) has narrated from ‘Affān – who said - Ḥammād ibn Salamah narrated to us – who said – Abū Ḥaḥṣ and Kulthūm ibn Jabr both narrated to us from Abū al-Ghādiyah who said: “‘Ammār has been killed so he told ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ who said, ‘I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying, ‘indeed his murderer and marauder are in the fire,’ so it was said to ‘Amr, ‘but it is you now who fight him,’ to which he replied, ‘his killer and marauder.’ Ibn Sa’d has also narrated it with the same chain in his *Ṭabaqāt* and this is authentic to Abū al-Ghādiyah as has been earlier mentioned. However the expression, “... he told ‘Amr...”, has Abū al-Ghādiyah narrated it from ‘Amr,

1 Al-Mālikī says in his book *al-Ṣuḥbah wal-Ṣaḥābah* (pg.119) of Shaykh ‘Abd Allāh al-Sa’d: “Our teacher has excelled in much of what he has said of these [narrations] and he has authenticated some of their chains, even if he did not commit to the authenticity of the narration itself.” (continued on pg. 183)

2 (continued from pg. 181) I — author — say: this is your deficiency in comprehension since the shaykh did not authenticate the narration but said instead, “in its chain there are problems,” and he only authenticated the incident of Abū al-Ghādiyah killing ‘Ammār رضي الله عنه as will follow.

or is it from the narration of Kulthūm ibn Jabr from ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ? If it is the first one, then it is authentic as has been mentioned, and if it is the second — and this seems the closest to being correct since it goes, “he told ‘Amr,” and “it was said to ‘Amr, ‘it is you here now who is fighting him,” this indicates that Abū al-Ghādiyah does not narrate it from ‘Amr; and therefore al-Dhahabī states in *al-Siyar* (2/544): “Its chain has interruptions.” Perhaps what he refers to by the interruptions is what has been previously mentioned that Kulthūm ibn Jabr is not known to have heard from ‘Amr, instead he heard only from the younger Ṣaḥābah and those whose demise occurred fairly late from them, infact he narrates from the generation of the Tābi‘īn and Abū al-Ghādiyah, it appears, is one of those whose demise occurred very late since al-Bukharī has recorded in his *Tārīkh* that Abū al-Ghādiyah is from among those whose demise occurred between the years 70 and 80, and he also mentioned him among those whose demise occurred between 90 and 100. It is for this reason that Abū al-Faḍl ibn Ḥajar, in *Ta’jīl al-Manfa‘ah* (2/52) says: “And ‘Amr was granted a long life.” As for Kulthūm he has expressly stated that he narrates directly from Abū al-Ghādiyah as has been mentioned previously.

Another chain:- Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim, in *al-Āḥād wa al-Mathānī* (809), says: Al-‘Abbās ibn al-Walīd al-Nursī narrated to us — who said — Mu‘tamir ibn Sulaymān narrated to us — who said — I heard from Layth from Mujāhid from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ who said: “Two men came to ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ arguing the matter of ‘Ammār so he — ‘Amr — said, ‘both of you leave him as I have heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying, ‘O Allah, the Quraysh are hell-bent on ‘Ammār, the killer of ‘Ammār and his marauder is in the Fire.”

Al-Ṭabarānī narrates it from Layth in *al-Kabīr* as mentioned in *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* (9/297) and al-Haythamī said: “Layth has expressly heard it, and its narrators are those of *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.”

Layth, he is ibn Abī Sulaym and he is weak. His memory was such that he would mix up his narrations and most of the scholars have taken him to be weak but worthy of consideration that his narrations are to be recorded.

As for the *matn* [text] of this narration, the discussion on it will follow with Allah's will.

This narration has also been narrated by al-Ḥākim in *al-Mustadrak* (3/387), from Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-Ḥāfiẓ - who said - Yahya ibn Muḥammad has narrated to us - who said - 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Mubārak has narrated to us from al-Mu'tamir ibn Sulaymān — from his father — from Mujāhid..., al-Ḥākim has said that 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Mubārak who is reliable and trustworthy, has solely narrated it from Mu'tamir from his father, and if it is the case then it is authentic, upon the criteria of Shaykhayn [al-Bukhārī and Muslim], although they did not narrate it, however the people have [mostly] narrated it from Mu'tamir from Layth from Mujāhid.

I say that the correct version is that it is narrated from Layth from Mujāhid. As for the narration of 'Abd al-Raḥmān it has errors from two angles

- i. Most of them narrate it from Mu'tamir, from Layth, as mentioned by al-Ḥākim.
- ii. 'Abd al-Raḥmān narrated it by taking the general path of narration from Mu'tamir, so he narrated it from his father since most of the time his narrations are from his father, and what is popularly known from the scholars is that those who narrate contrary to the regular path are preferred over the regular path since this indicates his memory.

As far as the *matn* is concerned, this incident has been narrated via a different chain from 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ, from his father, however the wording, "the killer of 'Ammār and his marauder are in the fire," do not appear.

Aḥmad (2/164;206) has narrated from Yazīd - who said - al-'Awwām has narrated to us - who said - Aswad ibn Mas'ūd narrated to us from Ḥanzalah ibn Khuwaylid al-'Anbarī who said: "While I was in the company of Mu'āwiyah when suddenly two men came in disputing the head of 'Ammār, each one of them saying, 'I killed him,' to which 'Abd Allāh responded, 'let

the soul of one of you be pleased since I heard Allah's Messenger ﷺ saying: "the transgressing group will kill him..."

Ibn Sa'd has also narrated it in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (3/253), al-Bukhārī in his *Tārīkh* (3/39), al-Nasā'ī in *al-Khaṣā'is* (164), all of them by way of Yazīd with this chain. After narrating it in his *Mu'jam al-Mukhtaṣṣ* (pg.96) al-Dhahabī says: "Its chain is good, since al-Aswad has been ratified by Ibn Ma'īn." It has also been narrated al-Bukhārī in his *Tārīkh* (3/39), al-Nasā'ī in *al-Khaṣā'is* (165), Abū Nu'aym in his *Ḥilyah* (7/198), all by way of Muḥammad ibn Ja'far — from Shu'bah — from al-'Awwām — from a man from Banū Shaybān — from Hanẓalah ibn Suwayd...

I consider the first chain to be closest to that which is correct for two reasons:

- i. Shu'bah is known to sometimes err in the names.
- ii. Yazīd ibn Hārūn has with him in this narration the additional name of the narrator since he mentioned the teacher of al-'Awwām as opposed to Shu'bah, although this is not a major difference since the person from Banū Shaybān is al-'Anzī' who was mentioned previously. [The tribes of] Shaybān and 'Anzah join at Asad ibn Rab'ah ibn Nizār, and Shaybān is combined with 'Anzah now — as far as I am aware — since most of Rab'ah is combined under 'Anzah, and perhaps this is of very old as Shu'bah indicates by saying, "a man from Banū Shaybān, and he has also been ascribed to 'Anzah in the narration of Yazīd ibn Hārūn." Although this is not the place where the discussion on the chain and verifying it ought to be, the point was merely to highlight the variance to the narration of Layth ibn Abī Sulaym.

Ibn Sa'd has narrated in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (3/253): Abū Mu'āwiyah — from al-A'mash — from 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ziyād — from 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith who said: "I was travelling with Mu'āwiyah on the return journey from

1 See the discussion on his name in the footnotes of *Musnad Aḥmad* (11/97, Mu'assasah Risālah edition) - translator

Şiffin, between him and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ when ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ said: “O my father, I had heard Allah’s Messenger saying to ‘Ammār: ‘Wayhak [an expression indicating sympathy] O son of Sumayyah, the transgressing party will kill you,” to which ‘Amr said to Mu‘āwiyah, ‘do you hear what this one is saying?’

It has also been narrated by Aḥmad (2/206) by way of al-A‘mash with the same chain, as well as by al-Nasā’ī in *al-Khaṣā’iṣ* (166-168), and he discussed the variations and different versions of this ḥadīth, and narrations similar to this have been found with alternative chains.¹

The important part of all of this is that none of these variant narrations mention what has been mentioned by Layth in his narration, except the ḥadīth of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr in *al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī, however in that narration appears Muslim al-Malā’ī and he is considered weak as mentioned by al-Haythamī in *Majma‘ al-Zawā’id* (9/297).

There is another ḥadīth, Ibn Sa’d relates in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (3/2510 from Ishāq ibn al-Azraq – who said - ‘Awf al-A‘rābī narrated to us from Ḥasan — from his mother — from Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها, who said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying, ‘the rebellious party will kill ‘Ammār,’ I do not suppose him except to have said, ‘his killer will be in the fire.’”

I say that this addition is not correct, infact it is rejected, for two reasons:

- i. This ḥadīth has been narrated via many chains besides the chain of ‘Awf al-A‘rābī — from Ḥasan — from his mother — from Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها as recorded by Muslim, Aḥmad, al-Ṭayālīsī, Ibn Sa’d, al-Bayhaqī in his *Sunan* and *al-Dalā’il*, al-Nasā’ī in *al-Kubrā*, al-Ṭabarānī and al-Baghawī, and none of them have this addition. To the contrary, al-Ṭabarānī, in *al-Kabīr* (23/363) narrates via ‘Uthmān ibn al-Haytham and Howdhah ibn Khalīfah, both of them, from ‘Awf, with the rest of the chain, but without this particular addition.

1 See *al-Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa’d (3/253), *al-Ḥākim* (3/386-387), *Majma‘ al-Zawā’id* (9/297) among others.

This narration has been recorded from other Ṣaḥābah as well and none mention this addition.

- ii. ‘Awf expressed uncertainty regarding this addition — as it appears in the narration mentioned earlier — and all of these are clear reasons for the inaccuracy of the addition and it contradicting the more established versions.

Another variant chain has been narrated by Ibn Sa’d in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (3/259), al-Ḥākim in *al-Mustadrak* (3/385-386), by way of Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar — he is al-Wāqidī — who narrates from ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith — from his father — from ‘Umārah ibn Khuzaymah ibn Thābit — from ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ that he said to those who brought their dispute to him: “By Allah, they are disputing about nothing except the Fire!” — and Allah knows best.

As for the incident of the murder of ‘Ammār by way of Abū al-Ghādiyah, then that is established and no doubt it is a major sin. However, none has said of the Ṣaḥābah — may Allah be pleased with them all — that they do not sin or commit major sins.

The summary of it all is that the narration tracing back to the Prophet ﷺ, “the killer of ‘Ammār and his marauder are in the fire,” there is speculation with regards to its reliability, and Allah knows best. As for the incident regarding the murder of ‘Ammar by way of Abū al-Ghādiyah, that is established. [end quote]

Secondly, it Still Does Not Incriminate Mu‘āwiyah

I say that even if we consider the narration reliable, there is nothing that indicates the flaw of Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه, since Mu‘āwiyah did not kill him, neither was he pleased with his murder. As for Ibn Taymiyyah, his words have been interfered with which results in a change in meaning.¹ This is the verbatim quotation from

1 Regarding what al-Mālikī has quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah, he has not produced the quote in its entirety and has thereby taken liberties by misrepresenting what has actually been said.

the *Fatāwā* of Ibn Taymiyyah (35/76):

... as for those who were pleased at the murder of ‘Ammār, his situation will be the same. What is known that there were many in the camp who were not pleased by the murder of ‘Ammār, like ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and others besides him. In fact all the people [in that camp] were outraged at his murder, even Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr.

As such, whatever happened whether it be the fighting etc., happened on account of variant interpretation of the texts and situation and can be attributed to *ijtihād* [scholarly discretion]. Al-Ash‘arī has stated in *al-Ibānah* (pg.78):

... likewise, what happened between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah — may Allah be pleased with them both — occurred on account of *ijtihād*; and all the Ṣaḥābah are trustworthy; not accused in their religion. Allah has praised all of them and made it a religious duty to honour them all, and respect them all, and love them all, and to disassociate ourselves from anyone who ridicules any one of them. May Allah be pleased with them all.

The Aḥādīth Which are Authentic But Do Not Refer to Mu‘āwiyah

The First Narration

The narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه:

The destruction of my ummah will be at the hands of youngsters from Quraysh.

It has been said:

The narration on the dispraise of Mu‘āwiyah is the narration of Abū Hurayrah, “the *fasād* [corruption] of my ummah — and in some versions *halāk* [destruction] — is at the hands of the foolish among Quraysh,” this narration is in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, and the explanation of who the fools are has come by way of Abū Hurayrah himself in another narration: “Banū Ḥarb and Banū Marwān,” and at the top of Banū Ḥarb is Mu‘āwiyah.

I will start out by saying that this statement is flawed in a many ways and comprises of a number of glaring errors, and farfetched interpretations, the explanation of which is as follows:

1. This version is not the wording in *al-Bukhārī*. Actually, I have not come across any of the scholars of ḥadīth who have narrated it with that wording! Al-Bukhārī states in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (6649):

Mūsā ibn Ismā‘īl has narrated to us — who said — ‘Amr ibn Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd ibn ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd has narrated to us — who said — my grandfather narrated to me saying: “I was once sitting with Abū Hurayrah in the Prophet’s صلی الله علیه وسلم Masjid in al-Madīnah and with us was Marwān, and Abū Hurayrah said, ‘I heard the trustworthy, believed one [i.e. Nabi Muḥammad صلی الله علیه وسلم] saying, ‘the destruction of my ummah will be at the hands of youngsters from Quraysh,’ to which Marwān said, ‘may Allah curse them, youngsters!’ So Abū Hurayrah said, ‘if I wished to say the family of so-and-so, and the

family of so-and-so, I could have said.' I [ʿAmr ibn Yaḥya] used to go with my grandfather to Banū Marwān in Shām when they had become the monarchs, when he saw them naïve youngsters, he said that perhaps it is them, and I told him he knows best.”

Notice how the utterance “youngster” has been erased from the narration [quoted by the detracting party]? This particular expression appears in many variant narrations, and the reason for that is that the word “Ughaylimah” is the plural of “Ghulām”. Ibn al-Athīr says:

What is intended by “Ughaylimah” is children, and that on account of the diminutive word.” This excludes Muʿāwiyah. Another plausible explanation for this word is the children of those who have been appointed as rulers. So the corruption came about on account of them and therefore it is attributed to them, and in this way Muʿāwiyah is also excluded.¹

Ibn Ḥajar has stated in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (13/12):

The diminutive of “Ghilmah”, plural of “Ghulām”, an individual of diminutive plural “Ghulayyim” with a *tashdīd* [emphasis on a particular letter]. It is said to [describe] a child from the time of birth until he matures by experiencing nocturnal emissions. “Ghulām”, the diminutive “Ghulayyim”, the plural “Ghilmān”, “Ghilmah” and “Ughaylimah” and they [the Arabs] do not say “Aghlimah” even though it is in conformity to the pattern, as if they were independent of it since they used the word “Ghilmah”. Al-Dāwūdī has mentioned something strange, as quoted by Ibn al-Tīn, he prescribed a *fatḥah* [diacritical sign denoting a vowel] to the hamzah and a *kasrah* [diacritical sign denoting a different vowel] to the Ghayn. It is sometimes used for a man with consolidated power, with resemblance to a young person in his strength and power. Ibn al-Athīr says: “What is intended by ‘Ughaylimah’ is children, therefore the diminutive

1 This interpretation is more apt, and the first is slightly problematic since none of the rulers of Banū Umayyah were handed the Khilāfah prior to attaining maturity.

word.” I say that the words child and youngster are at times used in the diminutive form for one of weak mind, planning and religion, even if such a person has matured and it is the intended meaning here¹ since the leaders from Banū Umayyah were not appointed to the position of khilāfah before attaining puberty, and likewise those whom they had appointed to govern and given responsibilities of state. Unless the intended meaning behind “youngsters” is the children of those appointed as khilāfah, who on account of them corruption began, so it is attributed to them, and the more appropriate way is to apply a general meaning.

2. Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه has indicated the first of these youngsters was Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah.

Al-Bukhārī has narrated in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* (66) the narration from Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه that he used to seek refuge from the rule of children and fools, by way of Ibn Abī Dhi‘b — from Sa‘īd ibn Sam‘ān — from Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. This chain to Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه is authentic.

Al-Ṭabarānī has narrated in *al-Awsaṭ* (1379), from the narration of ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān — from Abū Ḥāzim — from Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه who said: “In this bag of mine is a narration, which, if I narrated it to you, you would stone me.” Then he said, “O Allah, let me not reach the turn of the year sixty.” When asked about what is to happen in year sixty he replied, “the rule of children.” However, in this chain is ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jud‘ān who is weak in ḥadīth.

Ibn ‘Adī has narrated in *al-Kāmil* (6/81) by way of Kāmil Abū al-‘Alā’ who said:

I heard from Abū Ṣāliḥ, who was the Mu‘adhin, and he used to call out the Adhān for them, saying: “I heard Abū Hurayrah saying that he heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم say, ‘seek refuge in Allah from the turn of the year seventy, and the rule of children.’”

1 Later on we will see that it is not the intended meaning, see *al-Fatḥ* (12/13).

Abū Ṣālīḥ the Mowlā¹ of Ḍubā'ah, his name is Maynā', according to what Imām Muslim has said. Al-Nasā'ī and al-Dūlābī have also named him. None besides Kāmil Abū al-'Alā' narrate from him. Ibn Ḥibbān has ratified him, as well as al-Dhahabī in *al-Mīzān*, and al-Tirmidhī also reports his narrations.²

Ibn 'Adī³ has brought a number of narrations from Kāmil, Abū al-'Alā', al-Tamīmī al-Sa'dī, this one among them and said regarding him: "I expect that there is no problem with him."

Ibn Ma'īn considered him reliable⁴; and Ibn Ḥibbān said: "He would reverse the chains and link the interrupted chain without realising, and when this became excessive, it invalidates relying on his narrations."⁵ Ibn Sa'd said: "Does not narrate much, not [all] that."⁶

Allah ﷻ accepted the supplication of Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه and he passed away in the year 59 A.H, and the year 60 A.H is the year in which Yazīd took power, so he would be the first of the youngsters assuming the meaning of 'youngster' to be one of weak mind, planning and religion even though he was mature in age.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fath* (13/13):

Ibn Baṭṭāl has said that the intended meaning of destruction has been clarified by another narration from Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه as recorded by 'Alī ibn Ma'bad, and Ibn Abī Shaybah, from a variant chain from Abū Hurayrah رضى الله عنه from the Prophet ﷺ who said: "I seek refuge in Allah from the rule of children," and it was asked what is the rule of children? To which he replied, "if you obey them you will be destroyed [in your religion] and if

1 Freed bondsman

2 See *al-Thiqāt* (5/591) of Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Mīzān* (4/539)

3 *al-Kāmil* (6/80)

4 *Tārīkh ibn Ma'īn* (3/484) narration of al-Dūrī

5 *al-Majrūhīn* (2/227)

6 *al-Ṭabaqāt* (6/379)

you disobey them they will destroy you,” i.e. with regards to your worldly affairs; by the loss of life or property or both. In the narration of Ibn Abī Shaybah it says that Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه was walking in the market and said: “O Allah, let me not see the year 60; and not the rule of children.” This is an indication that the first of the “youngsters” was in the year 60; and that is exactly what occurred since Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah was appointed ruler in that year and remained until 64 A.H. When he died his son Mu‘āwiyah ibn Yazīd took charge and he remained for a few months before passing.

The incident at the end of the narration: “... I used to go with my grandfather to Banū Marwān in Shām when they had become the monarchs, when he saw them naïve youngsters, he said that perhaps it is them, and I told him he knows best,” is a clear indication that the “youngsters” mentioned in the ḥadīth were the children of whoever was ruling. This excludes Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fath* (13/12):

The statement, “when he saw them naïve youngsters,” strengthens the earlier possibility and that the intended meaning is the children of those who were ruling. As for the uncertainty of which of them was intended in the narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه, then it is from the fact that Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه did not mention their names expressly and that those mentioned later on are among them in general, and that the first of the “youngsters” is Yazīd as indicated to by Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه when he specified the turn of the year 60 A.H and the rule of children, since Yazīd would dismiss the senior governors and replace them with the young men from his relatives.

The Second Narration

The narration of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه who reported:

I was playing with children when Allah’s Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم happened to pass by (us). I hid myself behind the door. He came and patted my shoulders

and said, “go and call Mu‘āwiyah.” I returned and said, “he is busy in taking food.” He asked me to go again and call Mu‘āwiyah to him. I went (and came back) and said that he was busy in taking food, whereupon he ﷺ said, “may Allah not fill his belly.”

Narrated by Muslim in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2604).

It has been said that there are two flaws of Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ in this narration:

1. The prayer of the Messenger ﷺ against Mu‘āwiyah.
2. Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ delay in responding to the call of the Messenger ﷺ and that he continued eating which indicates no concern.

The response to the first allegation is in three parts:

- I. This supplication is considered an expression that passed the lips of the Messenger ﷺ without intent. As the Messenger ﷺ said to ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, “may your right hand be filled with dust,” and to Ṣafiyyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, “may you be wounded and your head shaved,” and to Mu‘adh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, “may your mother be barren of you.”
- II. The scholars of ḥadīth have understood this narration to be one of merit for Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ. Scholars like Muslim, al-Nawawī, Ibn ‘Asākir, al-Dhahabī, Ibn Kathīr and al-Haythamī have endorsed this view.

* Ibn ‘Asākir has stated in his *Tārīkh* (59/106): “This is the most authentic of what has been narrated on the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ.”

* Al-Nawawī has stated on his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (16/156): “Muslim has understood from this narration that Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ did not deserve to be prayed against, so that is why he included it under this chapter; and others have taken it as a virtue of Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ, since it is — in reality — a supplication for him.”¹

1 See also *Usd al-Ghābah* (1027) by Ibn al-Athīr

- * Al-Dhahabī has stated in *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz* (2/699): “Perhaps this is a merit for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه since the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم has also said, “O Allah, whoever I have cursed or spoken harshly to; make that a means of purification and mercy for them.”
- * Ibn Kathīr, in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/402) has stated: “Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه has benefitted from that supplication in this world and the next. As for this world, when he became the leader in al-Shām he would eat seven meals a day. A platter would be brought before him laden with meat and onions and he would eat it. He would eat meat seven times in the day, and from sweets and desserts, and fruits, plenty. He would say, “By Allah, I do not become filled, I only get fatigued.” This is a trait that is desired by kings. As for the hereafter, then Muslim has followed this narration by one which is also narrated by al-Bukhārī and others via numerous chains from a number of Ṣaḥābah that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “O Allah, I am but a human being, so any slave [of yours] whom I have harmed verbally or have lashed or prayed against, and he is not deserving of it, let that be a compensation for them and a means of gaining close to You on the Day of Judgement.” So Muslim has managed to bring this narration together proving a virtue for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and he has not mentioned of him [any virtue] other than this.

III. So if we take the supplication on its apparent meaning, then all that it amounts to is the lengthy period of eating, which indicates to abundance of it but that is not a flaw in terms of the hereafter. Whoever is not in harm’s way as a result of a flaw which affects the hereafter is not excluded from complete accomplishment.

As for the second alleged flaw, it can be responded to in two ways:

- i. The narration does not mention expressly that Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه told Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم summoned him and he

delayed. All that it possibly means is that when Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه saw him eating he felt shy to relay the message so he returned to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم both times.

- ii. Assuming that Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه did inform him that he was summoned by the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم, it appears that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه assumed that the matter was not urgent and that it was a courtesy. He did not understand it to be an immediate summons.

The Third Narration

The Khilāfah will last thirty years, and then it will become a cruel monarchy.

And the first monarch was Mu‘āwiyah.

I say that the meaning that is implied by ‘aḍūḍ [cruel] is harshness and oppression as is mentioned in *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* (pg.835).

Ibn al-Athīr has mentioned in *al-Nihāyah* (pg.622): “... then it will become a cruel monarchy,” i.e. the people will be afflicted with harshness and oppression, as if they are being bitten.

In response to this I say the following: the ḥadīth is not worded as such!

The ḥadīth has been narrated by Aḥmad (5/220), al-Tirmidhī (2226), Abū Dāwūd (4646), al-Nasā’ī in *al-Kubrā* (8155), all of them by way of Sa’īd ibn Jumhān — from Safīnah رضي الله عنه, who said that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

The khilāfah will remain in my ummah for thirty years, then it will become a monarchy after that.¹

¹ The chain is authentic.

In *al-Muntakhab min 'ilal al-Khallāl* (pg. 217) it appears:

Al-Marrūdhī said: “I mentioned the narration of Safīnah to Abū ‘Abd Allāh [i.e. Aḥmad] and he authenticated it and said it is authentic.”

The word ‘aḍūḍ does not appear in any of the sources.

Yes, it has been narrated by al-Ṭayālīsī (228), al-Bayhaqī in *al-Kubrā* (16407) and in *Shu‘ab al-Īmān* (5616), Abū Ya‘lā (873), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (367) (91), and ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Tamhīd* (14/245) all of them by way of al-Layth ibn Abī Sulaym — from ‘Abd a-Raḥmān ibn Sābiṭ — from Abū Tha‘labah al-Khushanī — from Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ and Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal — from the Messenger ﷺ who said:

Indeed Allah has begun this affair with prophethood and mercy, then it shall become a khilāfah with mercy, then it shall become a cruel monarchy, and then tyranny and force and chaos will become common in the ummah, they will regard lawful the [forbidden] private parts [zinā: unlawful sexual relationships], and alcohol, and silk, and they will be assisted despite that and be provided with sustenance always, until they meet Allah.¹

And this narration is not sound in terms of the chain; and in terms of the text it contradicts the authentic narrations. In the chain appears al-Layth ibn Abī Sulaym, who is weak, and the opinions of the scholars have been quoted regarding his status as a narrator.

As for the text, it goes against the verse in the Qur’an:

If you help Allah [His religion]; He will help you...²

How is it possible that they consider zinā and alcohol lawful and they are still

1 See *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* (5/189)

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 7

aided with divine assistance and provided with sustenance until they meet their Rabb?

Aḥmad has narrated in his *Musnad* (18430), and al-Ṭayālīsī (438) an abridged narration, al-Bazzār (2796), al-Bayhaqī in *al-Dalā'il* (2843), all of them by way of Dāwūd ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wāsiṭī — who said — Ḥabīb ibn Sālim narrated to me — from Nu'mān ibn Bashīr رضي الله عنه who said:

We were sitting in the Masjid with Allah's Messenger ﷺ; and Bashīr was one to withhold his speech. Abū Tha'labah al-Khushanī entered and said, "O Bashīr ibn Sa'd, do you remember the ḥadīth of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ regarding the leaders?" So Ḥudhayfah responded, "I recall his sermon." So Abū Tha'labah sat down and Ḥudhayfah narrated to him from the Messenger ﷺ: "Prophethood will remain among you as long as Allah wishes it to remain, then He will raise it when He wishes to raise it, Then it will be khilāfah upon the pattern of Prophethood for as long as Allah wishes it to remain, then He will raise it when He wishes to raise it, then it will become cruel monarchy, and will remain for as long as Allah wishes it to remain, then He will raise it when He wishes to raise it, then it shall become tyrannical monarchy, and it will remain for as long as Allah wishes it to remain, then He will raise it when He wishes to raise it, then it will return to khilāfah upon the pattern of Prophethood, then he remained silent." Ḥabīb [the narrator] says, "when 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz rose up, and Yazīd ibn Nu'mān ibn al-Bashīr was from his companions, I wrote to him with this narration reminding him of it and I said to him, 'I expect that Amīr al-Mu'minīn — meaning 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz — is after the monarchs of cruelty and tyranny,' so what I had written had been presented to 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz and it pleased him and impressed him."

Dāwūd ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wāsiṭī was verified by Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī¹, and Ibn Ḥibbān included him in *al-Thiqāt*.²

1 *Musnad al-Ṭayālīsī* (1/58)

2 (6/280)

Ḥabīb ibn Sālim, he is al-Anṣārī, the Mowla of Nu‘mān ibn Bashīr. Abū Ḥātim verified him¹, as well as Abū Dāwūd, and Ibn Ḥibbān² included him in *al-Thiqāt*. Al-Bukhārī said: “There is uncertainty with him.”³ Ibn ‘Adī, in *al-Kāmil* (2/406) said: “There are no major contradictions in texts of his narrations. However, there is confusion in some of the chains which he narrates.”

Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī solely narrates this narration. In *Aṭrāf al-Gharā’ib wa al-Afrād* of al-Dāraquṭnī (1988) it appears: “The narration, ‘we were sitting in the Masjid...’ and in it appears, ‘does any of you remember the narration regarding the rulers...’, Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī narrates this solely — from Dāwūd ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wāsiṭī — from Ḥabīb ibn Sālim — from Nu‘mān.”

Al-Bazzār (7/224) has flawed it with Irsāl⁴ and said: “... and this narration we do not know of anyone narrating it from Nu‘mān from Ḥudhayfah except Ibrāhīm ibn Dāwūd.”⁵

This also contradicts what has been narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (11/88) (11138):

Aḥmad ibn al-Naḍr narrated to us — saying — Sa‘īd ibn Ḥaḍḍ al-Nufaylī narrated to us — saying — Mūsā ibn A‘yan narrated to us from ibn Shihab⁶ — from Fiṭr ibn Khalīfah — from Mujāhid — from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه, who said that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “The beginning of this affair is Prophethood and mercy, then it will be a khilāfah and mercy, then monarchy and mercy, then leadership and mercy, then Imārah and mercy, then they will be biting each other for it as donkeys do, so it is your duty to

1 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (3/102)

2 *Ibn Ḥibbān* (4/137)

3 *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (2/218)

4 Interruption between the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and the generation of the Ṭābi‘īn.

5 That is how it appears in the book, switching the names, the correct name is Dāwūd ibn Ibrāhīm

6 Its meant to be Abū Shihāb, Mūsā ibn Nāfi‘ al-Asdī, al-Ḥannāṭ al-Kūfī; al-Bukhārī, Muslim and al-Nasā’ī report his narrations. See *al-Tahdhīb* (4/190).

engage in jihād, and the best of your jihād is in *ribāṭ* [guarding the borders], and the best of your *ribāṭ* is at ‘Asqalān [Ashkelon].

Al-Haythamī said in *al-Majma’* (5/190): “Al-Tabarānī narrates it and the narrators are reliable.”

Saʿīd ibn Ḥafṣ al-Nufaylī has been verified by Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Thiqāt* (8/268), and al-Nasāʾī has narrated by way of him as well. Maslamah ibn al-Qāsim said he is reliable and a group of scholars narrate from him. Al-Dhahabī, in *al-Kāshif* said: “Reliable,” and Ibn Ḥajar, in *al-Taqrīb* said: “Trustworthy, whose memory faltered towards the end of his life,” therefore this is a well-graded chain.

What becomes clear is that the correct version of the ḥadīth mentions monarchy without mentioning “cruelty”, etc., as narrated by Aḥmad (5/220), al-Tirmidhī (2226), Abū Dāwūd (4646), al-Nasāʾī in *al-Kubrā* (8155), all of them by way of Saʿīd ibn Jumhān — from Saḥīnah رضي الله عنه, who said that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

The khilāfah will remain in my ummah for thirty years, then it will become a monarchy after that.

Ibn Taymiyyah responded to a question regarding Yazīd ibn Muʿāwiyah in *Jāmi’ al-Masā’il* (5/154) saying:

There emerged after the demise of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه a wave of fitnahs and disunity and fragmentation which is a confirmation of what the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم foretold since he said, “there will be Prophethood and mercy, then khilāfah and mercy, then monarchy and mercy, then tyrannical monarchy.” So the period of Prophethood was a period of mercy, as was the period of al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, and the period of rule of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه was also a mercy, and after him began the cruel monarchy.

He also said in his *Fatāwā* (35/27):

Then this necessitates that the mixing of khilāfah and monarchy is allowed in our sharīʿah, and that does not negate his moral, upright status; even

though absolute khilāfah is the best. And whoever came to the aid of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and considered him a *Mujtahid* [scholar of discernment] in his affairs and did not attribute to him disobedience, then he is bound by one of these two views: either the validity of mixing monarchy with khilāfah, or no blame on his ijtihād.

In another place in his *Fatāwā* (4/478) he wrote:

Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the best of all monarchs by concensus.¹

The Fourth Narration

Wayḥ [an expression denoting sympathy] ‘Ammār, the rebellious party will kill him, he is calling them to Paradise and they are calling him to the Fire.²

This has been responded to with various explanations:

1. There are some of the scholars of ḥadīth who have criticised this narration and this has been reported of Imām Aḥmad, however, his final analysis was that the narration was reliable.

Ibn Taymiyyah says in his *Fatāwā* (35/76):

This narration has been criticised by a group of scholars, however Muslim has recorded it and it appears in some copies of *al-Bukhārī*.³

In *al-Muntakhab min al-‘ilal li al-Khallāl* (pg.222) it appears:

Ismā‘īl al-Ṣaffār has related to us that he heard Abū Umayyah Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm saying that he heard — whilst in the circle of Aḥmad ibn Hanbal, Yahya ibn Ma‘īn, Abū Khaythamah, and al-Muṭṭī that they mentioned, “the

1 See also *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/159), *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/439)

2 Narrated in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (346) and (2657) with a slight variation in wording

3 See *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/390), (4,405)

transgressing party will kill ‘Ammār,” that they commented that there is no authentic narration to that effect.¹

Yahya ibn Ma‘īn has said about the narration of al-Daqqāq Yazīd ibn al-Haytham ibn Ṭahmān (102):

Al-Darāwardī relates from al-‘Alā’ ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān — from his father that the Prophet ﷺ said to ‘Ammār, “the transgressing party will kill you,” it is not found in the book of al-Darāwardī. Someone who heard the book of al-‘Alā’ from al-Darāwardī — it was only a scroll — that this [narration] does not appear in it and it is only one incident that the Prophet ﷺ... as for al-Darāwardī, his memory is not all that, his book is far more reliable. He said, “I heard from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ibrāhīm — who said — that he heard his father saying that he heard Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal saying there have been 28 narrations narrated regarding the killing of ‘Ammār by the rebellious group, none of which are sound.”

In *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* (2/494), Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī said:

And this chain is not known, and the opposite has been reported from Aḥmad. Ya‘qūb ibn Shaybah al-Sadūsī has reported in his *Musnad* from the *Musnad* of ‘Ammār², have you heard Aḥmad being asked about the narration, ‘the transgressing party will kill him,’ and Aḥmad said it is as the Prophet ﷺ said, “he will be killed by the transgressing party.” And he said in this there is no sound narration from the Prophet ﷺ and he disliked talking about it more than this.”

2. Most copies of *al-Bukhārī* do not mention this addition ‘the transgressing party will kill him’. Al-Ḥumaydī did not include it in his *Jam‘ bayna al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* and he said that al-Bukhārī did not mention it at all. He said: “Perhaps it does not appear in the narration of al-Bukhārī, or he deliberately excluded it.”³

1 Al-Khallāl quotes it in *al-Sunnah* (2/463)

2 See *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/414)

3 See *al-Faṭḥ* by Ibn Ḥajar (1/542)

Among those who negate the existence of this addition is al-Mizzī in *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf* (3/427) he said:

It does not appear in it ‘the transgressing party will kill him.

However, a number of scholars have accepted it. Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fatḥ* (1/646) that it occurs in the narration of Ibn al-Sakan, and al-Karīmah, and others besides these two, and in the copy of al-Ṣāghhānī which he mentioned that he proofread against the copy of al-Firabrī. This addition has also been narrated by al-Isma‘īlī and al-Barqānī from this ḥadīth.¹

3. This addition has also been flawed with the *Idrāj* [insertion into the text].

Ibn Ḥajar said:

It appears to me that al-Bukhārī has omitted it [the addition] and that for a subtle point, and that is that Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه acknowledged that he did not hear that addition from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم which indicates that this addition was inserted into the texts, and the narration that expounds on this is not on the criteria of al-Bukhārī. It has been narrated by al-Bazzār from Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind — from Abū Naḍrah — from Abū Sa‘īd and he mentioned the narration of the construction of the Masjid, and that they each carried one brick at a time, so Abū Sa‘īd said: “My companions told me; I did not hear it from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم that he said, ‘O son of Sumayyah, the rebellious party will kill you.’” And the son of Sumayyah is ‘Ammār, Sumayyah was his mother’s name. and this narration is on the criteria of Muslim, and Abū Sa‘īd has identified whom he narrates from. It is in *Muslim* and *Nasā’ī*, by way of Abū Salamah — from Abū Naḍrah — from Abū Sa‘īd who said: “One who is definitely superior to me, Abū Qatādah, has narrated to me...” and he mentioned the ḥadīth. So al-Bukhārī sufficed with that which Abū Sa‘īd heard from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم directly, and not the rest. This is an indication of the detailed understanding and deep insight in identifying subtle flaws in narrations.

1 See *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* (4/415) and *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (2/490)

4. As for interpreting the narration that the killers were those who brought him and it was the group who fought alongside him, then this is a weak interpretation, and its flaws are clear. It implies, by necessity, that the Prophet ﷺ and his companions were responsible for the deaths of many of the martyrs like Ḥamzah and others.

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned in his *Fatāwā* (35/76):

It has been said that Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ interpreted the killers to be those who were responsible for bringing him to the battlefield and not his opponents; and that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ responded to that interpretation by saying that it would imply that we are responsible for the death of Ḥamzah [since we brought him]. There is no doubt that what 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said was correct.

5. Some have adopted an interpretation using semantics since the expression “*al-Fi'at al-Bāghiyah*” could translate as the transgressing, rebellious party or the party that was ‘seeking’ – seeking retribution for the blood of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, since they used to say, “we seek ibn ‘Affān at the tips of our spears.” Ibn Taymiyyah mentions this in his *Fatāwā* (35/76) saying, “it is nothing.” [i.e. this interpretation], and in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/390) he said: “This is a weak interpretation.”

6. The saying of the Prophet ﷺ, “the transgressing party will kill him,” does not indicate to Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ directly. It can be understood to mean those troops who undertook killing him and that is a group within the army since Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not pleased with his murder.

Ibn Taymiyyah says in his *Fatāwā* (35/76):

Furthermore the narration, “Ammār will be killed by the rebellious group,” is not absolute in referring to Mu'āwiyah and his companions. It can be understood to mean the troops who engaged him until they killed him, and they would constitute a group among the entire army. As for

those who were pleased at the murder of ‘Ammār, their situation will be the same. What is known that there were many in the camp who were not pleased by the murder of ‘Ammār like ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and others besides him. In fact all the people [in that camp] were outraged at his murder, even Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr.

7. The ḥadīth is taken on its apparent meaning, but it does not necessarily mean that the transgressing party is removed from the description of faith in Allah, or justifies cursing them. Allah says in the Qur’an:

If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah’s command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice.¹

Allah described both parties as believers in this verse, despite the fact that they fight each other.

Ibn Ḥazm says in *al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* (3/77):

The Mujtahid who errs, if he fights on account of what he believes to be the truth, seeking the grace of Allah with a sincere intention, not knowing that he is in the wrong, then he will be a rebellious party and he will be rewarded [for his ijtihād]. There is to be no implementation of the *Ḥadd* [legal punishment]. As for one who fights, knowing that he is in the wrong, then this is an enemy combatant upon whom the *Ḥadd* ought to be applied as well as retaliation. Such a person is attributed to sin and going against the leader, not a Mujtahid in error. The explanation for that can be found in the verse, “if two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9

back to Allah's command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice."

Al-Nawawī, in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (18/40), says:

The scholars say that this narration is clear evidence that 'Alī عليه السلام was in the right and that the other party were rebels. However, they were Mujtahids in this affair so there is no sin upon them for that as we have previously mentioned at many places, among them this chapter. And in this narration is a miracle from the miracles of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم through many ways: among them is that he predicted that 'Ammār would be killed, and that his killers would be Muslims, and that they would be rebels, and that a fight would occur among the Ṣaḥābah, and that they would be two parties, one rebellious, the other not, and all of this happened just as light of dawn occurs — may the peace, mercy and salutation of Allah be conferred to he who does not utter anything of his own, all that it is is Divine revelation."

Ibn Kathīr mentions in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (4/538):

Even if they were rebels in that affair, they were Mujtahids as well in terms of what occurred in fighting; and not every Mujtahid is correct. In fact the Mujtahid who is correct acquires two rewards and the one who errs acquires one reward. As for those who add to the narration after the words, "the rebellious party will kill you," may they be deprived of intercession on the Day of Judgement since that have falsely attributed this addition to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم as he did not say that since it was not related by any acceptable means.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in his *Fatāwā* (35/76), states:

There is nothing in the fact that 'Ammār will be killed by the transgressing party that negates what we have previously mentioned, for indeed Allah has said:

If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah's command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice.

So He has made them both — even though they fought and rebelled — believers and brothers. In fact by instructing to fight the rebellious party He has made them believers. Furthermore, not all transgressing, injustice and rebellion takes the general people out of the state of faith, neither does it warrant their being cursed; what about those who were such from the best generations? Every person who is a rebel, or unjust, or transgresses, or engages in what would be a sin, they are of two kinds: *Muta'awwil* [one who can explain his situation by a particular interpretation], the other cannot. The *Muta'awwil* is a Mujtahid, just as the scholars of knowledge and religion exercised their scholarly discretion and considered lawful some matters, whereas others considered it prohibited. Some considered lawful certain types of drinks, and some of them certain interest-based transactions, and some of them certain contracts of marriage and the like thereof. So this kind of example has prevailed in the earliest generations; and likewise these [the party of Mu'āwiyah] were *Muta'awwil* and Mujtahid and the extent to what can be said of them is that they erred. Allah says in the Qur'an:

... Our Rabb, do not take us to task if were forget or err.

It has been established in the reliable narrations that this supplication has been accepted by Allah. Allah also told us about Dāwūd and Sulaymān عليهما السلام that they both ruled on the issue of the crops, but He favoured one above the other in knowledge and in judgement, although He praised both their knowledge and judgement. The scholars are the heirs of the Prophets, so if one understands something contrary to the other in a particular matter, its not blameworthy nor is it a hindrance from acknowledging their knowledge and religiousness. However, if the contrary practise was there

despite full knowledge of the ruling it becomes a sin and an indictment, and persistence upon such is a major offense and whenever knowledge of it is absolutely essential then to consider it lawful would be considered disbelief. So transgression and rebellion is treated like this as well. That if a rebel was a Mujtahid, Muta'awwil and he did not realise that he is a rebel; and to the contrary believed he was on the truth even though he erred in his judgement then calling such a person a transgressor or rebel does not necessarily mean that the person is a sinner, let alone declaring such a person a violator of the law. As for those who call for fighting the rebels who are Muta'awwil they say that the instruction to fight these rebels is to eliminate the possible harms that might arise from their rebellion and there is no punishment for them; only preventing them from transgressing the limits. They further say that they are upon moral and religious integrity and they have not become violating sinners. They also liken them to those who are not under obligation, just as one ought to prevent the child, or one who has a mental impediment, or a sleepwalking person from causing harm, to the extent that even the animals are prevented from causing harm. At is compulsory for those who are killed in error from the believers that a diyah [blood money] be paid. Likewise those who are present before the ruler from people who deserve the legal penalties, and repents after having ability to fulfil it and the punishment is meted out to him, and one who repents from sin is like one who has no sin. The rebel who was a Muta'awwil is lashed according to Mālik, al-Shāfi'ī and Aḥmad; and there are many similar cases. Thereafter under the assumption that the transgression and rebellion was without *Ta'wīl* [justified interpretation] it would be a sin; and sins may be compensated for by following up with righteous deeds which wipe away sins, or by afflictions which are compensations for sins etc.

However, if one looks at the debates among scholars between whom there was no fighting or kingdom, and they had such interpretations which were far weaker than that of Mu'āwiyah. So someone who makes such an interpretation will not consider that he killed 'Ammār as he did not believe that he had transgressed in the first place; and such a person who does

not believe himself to be a transgressor while he is one in reality he is a Muta'awwil who has erred. And the jurists none of them are of the opinion to fight those who killed 'Ammār. However, they had two famous positions as was the position of the senior Ṣaḥābah — may Allah be pleased with them all. Some of them opined to fight alongside 'Ammār and his group, and others refrained from fighting completely. In each of these two groups there were some of the most senior Ṣaḥābah. So, in the first group was 'Ammār, Sahl ibn Ḥunayf, Abū Ayyūb and others; whereas in the second group there were likes of Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqās, Muḥammad ibn Maslamah, Usāmah ibn Zayd, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar and others — and perhaps majority of the seniors were of this view. There were none from either camp after 'Alī better than Sa'd; and he was from those who did not get involved. As for the 'Ḥadīth of 'Ammār' those who hold on to it as evidence for fighting, since the killers of 'Uthmān, if they are rebels, they need to be fought as Allah states: "... fight the aggressing party..." as for those who did not get involved they held on to the authentic prophetic narrations which warn against involvement when there is fitnah, and they interpret this fighting as fitnah. Furthermore, the Prophet ﷺ did not instruct with fighting neither was he pleased with it, all that he instructed with was reconciliation; and Allah instructed with responding to transgression but did not instruct with pre-emptive action against the transgressing party as He said:

If two groups of the believers fight each other, seek reconciliation between them. And if one of them commits aggression against the other, fight the one that commits aggression until it comes back to Allah's command. So if it comes back, seek reconciliation between them with fairness, and maintain justice. Surely Allah loves those who maintain justice.

They said the initial phase of fighting was not a divine instruction, rather the fighting is only allowed in response to a transgressing party; and if one had to kill every transgressor one would reach disbelief, as many believers, rather most people have some form of injustice or transgression. However, if two parties from the believers fight, our duty is to bring about

reconciliation; even though one party is not instructed with fighting; and if one party rebels after that, it ought to be fought against since it did not abandon fighting and did not respond to reconciliation; and the harms cannot be curtailed except with fighting. Their example is like the attacker whose crime can only be prevented by fighting him, as the Prophet ﷺ said, “he who is killed protecting his own property dies a martyr, he who is killed protecting his own life dies a martyr, he who is killed protecting his religion dies a martyr and he who dies protecting his family dies a martyr.” They say further that assuming the entire camp to be rebels then we have not been instructed to engage with them first with fighting, rather we are instructed with reconciliation. Also, it is not allowed for us to fight them if there are among them those who would rather retreat and not engage since they are very argumentative and disobedient. The purpose of it all is that this narration does not permit cursing any of the Ṣaḥābah, neither does it necessitate violation of moral and religious integrity.¹

The Fifth Narration

The narration of ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit from the Prophet ﷺ:

There will take charge of your affairs after me men who will introduce to you that which you disapprove, and they will disapprove of you that which you are acquainted with; hence there is no obedience to those who disobey Allah, and do not present excuses before your Rabb [for your disobedience in these matters].²

‘Ubādah said: “By Allah, Mu’āwiyah is from among them.”

I say that this narration with the addition, “by Allah, Mu’āwiyah is from among them,” appears in *al-Mustadrak* of al-Ḥākim (4/432)(5584) by way of Muslim ibn Khālīd — from Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Rifā‘ah — from his father that ‘Ubādah was standing in the middle of the home of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه

1 See also *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/394) and (4/420) it is very important.

2 This is how it appears in *Musnad Ahmad* (37/449) and *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn ‘Asākir (26/198)

and said:

Verily I have heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying, “there will take charge of your affairs after me men who will introduce to you that which you disapprove, and they will disapprove of you that which you are acquainted with; hence there is no obedience to those who disobey Allah, so do not rebuke yourselves,” then ‘Ubādah said, “by Allah, Mu’āwiyah is from among them, and ‘Uthmān did not rebuke him with even an utterance.”

I say that this narration has three defects:

The First Defect

In the chain is Muslim ibn Khālīd, Abū Khālīd, al-Zanjī. They great scholars of ḥadīth are agreed upon him being weak: ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī, Ibn Ma‘īn in one narration, Aḥmad, al-Bukhārī, Abū Ḥātim, al-Nasā‘ī, and he has narrations which have been disclaimed; Ibn Ḥajar mentioned them in *al-Tahdhīb*¹ and he quoted al-Dhahabī saying:

Such narrations retract the strength of a narrator and he would be considered weak on account of them.

However, Muslim ibn Khālīd has been corroborated by Zuhayr ibn Mu’āwiyah as is in *al-Mustadrak* (4/431)(5583) and Zuhayr ibn Mu’āwiyah is from the narrators of the group, a reliable narrator and his narration from Abū Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī at the end. He has also been corroborated by a narration from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbād in the *Musnad* of al-Shāshī (1196).

He has also been corroborated by Yaḥya ibn Sulaym², without the addition, “by Allah, Mu’āwiyah is from among them,” as in the *Musnad* of Aḥmad (37/449) (22786).

1 *al-Tahdhīb* (4/68)

2 See also *al-Awsaṭ* by al-Ṭabarānī (3/190), and *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn ‘Asākir (26/197)

As for Yaḥya ibn Sulaym ibn Balj, Abū Balj, al-Fazārī al-Wāsiṭ:

- * He has been verified by al-Nasā'ī, Ibn Sa'd and al-Dāraqūṭnī.¹
- * Abū Ḥatim said: "He is acceptable in ḥadīth, no harm in him."²
- * Aḥmad said: "He narrated a disclaimed narration."³
- * Ibn Ḥibbān said of him: "There were some errors, but they were not severe to the extent that he deserved to be abandoned; neither did he come with that which man could not do without him so one treads with him the path of those who are upright, however I view that he should not be taken as a proof for what he narrates solely and he is from those whom one does *Istikhārah* [seeking guidance from Allah] regarding his narrations."⁴
- * Al-Bukhārī said: "There were some objectionable views regarding him."⁵

Yes, Muslim ibn Khālīd has also been corroborated by Ismā'īl ibn 'Ayyāsh as in *Musnad Aḥmad* (22821) and in it there is an incident. However, Ismā'īl ibn 'Ayyāsh is considered weak in those which he narrates from other than the Shāmis and this is one of those [which he narrates from other than a Shāmi]. Al-Haythamī in *al-Majma'* (5/408) states:

Ismā'īl ibn 'Ayyāsh has narrated this from the Ḥijāzīs, and his narrations from them are weak.⁶

1 *al-Tahdhīb* (4/498), *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/311), *'Su'ālāt al-Barqānī* (546)

2 *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (9/152)

3 *al-Tahdhīb* (4/498), *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/311)

4 *al-Majrūḥīn* (3/113)

5 *al-Tahdhīb* (4/498), this expression of al-Bukhārī "Fīhi naẓar" [about him there are some objectionable views] is sometimes used for a narrator who is seriously flawed, and sometimes it is used for a narrator with whom there is no major problem however there are some objectionable narrations which have been narrated by this particular narrator without the narrator necessarily being disclaimed. For more details on this discussion see *Ikhtisār 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (1/320), *Sharḥ Alfīyyat al-Ḥadīth* (2/3), *al-Taḥqīd wa al-Idāḥ* (139), *Fath al-Mughīth* (2/122), *Tadrib al-Rāwī* (1/410), *al-Raf' wa al-Takmil* (388), *al-Tankīl* (1/204), *Qawā'id fī 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (254).

6 See also *Sharḥ al-'īlāl* (2/773).

He has also been corroborated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Wāqid as it appears in *al-Mustadrak* (4/431) (5582), and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Wāqid is weak in ḥadīth.

The Second Defect

There are irreconcilable differences and inconsistencies in the chain. The narration in *Musnad Aḥmad* (37/430) is narrated by way of Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ayyāsh — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Khuthaym — from Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Rifā‘ah — from ‘Ubādah — he narrated it from ‘Ubādah without mentioning his father.

The narration in *Musnad Aḥmad* (37/450) is narrated by way of Suwayd ibn Sa‘īd — from Yaḥya ibn Sulaym — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Khuthaym — from Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Rifā‘ah — from his father — from ‘Ubādah; but this narration is weak on account of the weakness of Suwayd ibn Sa‘īd al-Harawī.

Al-Haythamī, in *al-Majma‘* (5/408), says:

Aḥmad narrates it in its entirety but he did not say: from Ismā‘īl, from his father. When ‘Abd Allāh narrates it he adds — from his father — and it is like that in *al-Ṭabarānī*, and its narrators are reliable.

The Third Defect

Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ubayd is unknown. Some say he is Ibn ‘Ubaydillah ibn -Rifā‘ah al-Zuraqī. Al-Tirmidhī has authenticated a narration of his,¹ and Ibn Ḥibbān has included him in *al-Thiqāt* (6/28).

Al-Dhahabī has said: “I do not know of anyone narrating from him besides from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Khuthaym.”²

In his *Taqrīb*, Ibn Ḥajar has said: “Acceptable i.e. if he is corroborated, otherwise he is lenient.”

1 *al-Jāmi‘* (Ḥadīth no.1210)

2 *al-Mīzān* (1/283)

And this narration of his has not been corroborated.

Al-‘Uqaylī has narrated this narration in *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (3/784) by way of Shahr ibn Ḥowshab — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ a similar narration and said:

As for the expression, “do not find excuses except by your better judgement,” it is not recorded except from this ḥadīth; and there have been similar meanings with alternate wordings found in narrations better than this.

Al-Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī has said in his book *al-Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah fī Manāqib al-‘Asharah* (233):

... a baseless claim, and fabricated lie, neither did ‘Ubādah complain against Mu‘āwiyah, nor did ‘Uthmān send him back, the matter is contrary to that according to what the most reliable and trustworthy reporters relate about their being in mutual agreement and returning each other to the truth in all affairs.

Assuming the validity of the narration then all it amounts to is the ijtihād of ‘Ubādah رضي الله عنه by applying the ḥadīth to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, as for ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān they had both appointed him as governor of al-Shām and none of them ever accused him during his period in office.

Many Ṣaḥābah and senior Tābi‘īn witnessed the monarchy of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and none of them resisted his obedience – may Allah be pleased with them all.¹

The Sixth Narration

The ḥadīth:

It is the covenant of the unlettered Prophet with me, that none shall love

1 See *Tārīkh Abī Zur‘ah* (1/189)

me except a believer and none shall hate me except a hypocrite.¹

This is responded to in two ways:

1. Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه did not resist pledging allegiance to 'Alī رضي الله عنه out of desire for the khilāfah or rule, neither did he fight him for these reasons. Instead it was done demanding retribution for the blood of 'Uthmān.

Yahya ibn Sulaymān al-Ju'fī, one of the teachers of al-Bukhārī, in his book, *Ṣiffīn*, and Ibn Hajar says in *al-Fath* (13/86) with a sound chain from Abū Muslim al-Khowlānī that he said to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

Do you contest the khilāfah from 'Alī رضي الله عنه; do you see yourself as an equal to him?" Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه replied, "no, I know very well that he is more virtuous than me and more deserving of ruling, but do you not know that 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was murdered unjustly, and I am his cousin and relative, all I seek is retribution for his blood? So go to 'Alī رضي الله عنه and tell him to hand over 'Uthmān's murderers to me," so they went to him and told him what happened to which 'Alī رضي الله عنه responded, "let him pledge his allegiance and leave the matter of the killers to me." However, Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه resisted so 'Alī رضي الله عنه went with his army from Iraq and stopped at Ṣiffīn; and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه also went there and this was in Dhū al-Hijjah in the year 36 A.H. There was mutual correspondence, but nothing came of it and eventually the fighting occurred.

We have found the chain of narration for what has been reported from al-Ju'fī — from Ya'lā ibn 'Ubayd — from his father — from Abū Muslim al-Khowlānī, as mentioned by al-Dhahabī in *al-Siyar* (3/140).²

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (78) — from 'Adī ibn Thābit — from Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh — from 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه. Al-Mālikī has stated that there is no doubt that Mu'āwiyah was from those who hated 'Alī and that he was one of the staunch enemies of 'Alī, *al-Ṣuḥbah wal-Ṣaḥābah* by Ḥasan Farḥān al-Mālikī.

2 See also *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn 'Asākir (59/132)

It is narrated *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn ‘Asākir (59/142) by way of Jarīr ibn ‘Abd al-Hamīd — from al-Mughīrah who said:

When the news of the murder of ‘Alī reached Mu‘āwiyah he began to weep and his wife said to him, “you cry for him yet you fought him?” he said, “pity unto you, do you not know what the people have lost in terms of virtue and *fiqh* [jurisprudence], and knowledge.”¹

From this it become clear that Mu‘āwiyah had some discretional interpretation for fighting ‘Alī عليه السلام.

Al-Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā al-Farrā’ [d. 458 A.H] has stated in his book, *Tanzīh Khāl al-Mu‘minīn Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān min al-Ẓulm wa al-Fisq* (pg. 83), when asked about what transpired between Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Alī عليه السلام, and whether it was valid to attribute to Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام injustice and sin, he replied:

It is not permitted to attribute any of that to him. Rather, it will be said that he did *ijtihād*, and he is rewarded for his *ijtihād* and the basis for his *ijtihād* was this: two *khulafā’* have appointed me prior to this and made me governor over Shām, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān عليه السلام, and I am upon what they had authorised me with until the ummah unifies upon a new leader and I will hand over to him what is under my control, but I am asking for retribution in the case of ‘Uthmān since I am his cousin and relative, and most deserving of his affairs and Allah says in the Qur’an,

And do not slay the soul [whose life] God has made inviolable, except with due cause. Whoever is slain wrongfully, We have certainly given his heir, a warrant; but let him not commit excess; for he is supported [by the Law].²

Ibn Ḥazm said in *al-Fiṣāl* (3/75):

1 See also *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/429)

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl: 33

Mu'āwiyah never ever denied the virtue of 'Alī, nor the rightful claim that he was the khalīfah. However, his ijtiḥād led him to put the revenge for 'Uthmān before the pledge of allegiance, and he saw himself more deserving of seeking retribution for the blood of 'Uthmān ibn Affān.

Al-Ash'arī has stated in *al-Ibānah* (pg. 78):

... likewise, what happened between 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah — may Allah be pleased with them both — occurred on account of ijtiḥād; and all the Ṣaḥābah are trustworthy; not accused in their religion. Allah has praised all of them and made it a religious duty to honour them all, and respect them all, and love them all, and to disassociate ourselves from anyone who ridicules any one of them. May Allah be pleased with them all.

2. The Ṣaḥābah who were present when the fighting occurred, whether from the camp of 'Alī or Mu'āwiyah (عليه السلام), they did not understand what the Rāfiḍah have sought to understand from the texts that they mention. Neither side accused the other of hypocrisy or heresy or departure from the religion.

Ibn Abī Shaybah has narrated in his *Muṣannaf* (37865) and Ibn 'Asākir (1/346) in *Tārīkh Dimashq* from 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Urwah who said:

A man from those who witnessed Ṣiffīn said that he had seen 'Alī leaving [his tent] and looking at the people of Shām and he used to say: “O Allah, forgive me and them.”

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta'ẓīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (362) by way of Sufyān — from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad — from his father who said:

'Alī heard on the Day of Jamal or the Day of Ṣiffīn a person exceeding the bounds in what he was saying [against the opposing party] so he said: “Do not say anything except that which is good. All that they are is a people who claim that we have rebelled against them, and we say that they have rebelled against us; and on that we have fought them.”

In this chain there is interruption since Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn did not meet ‘Alī عليه السلام, but there are many other reports from ‘Alī عليه السلام which reinforce this incident.

From such reports is what Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta’ẓīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (363) by way of Muḥammad ibn Rāshid — from Makḥūl that the companions of ‘Alī عليه السلام asked regarding the companions of Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام, “what is their situation?” He said: “They are believers.” Makḥūl did not hear from ‘Alī عليه السلام so the chain is interrupted.

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta’ẓīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (363) by way of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Mājishūn — from ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Abī ‘Awn who said:

‘Alī passed by the martyrs at Siffin while leaning on al-Ashtar and he found Ḥābis al-Yemānī slain to which al-Ashtar exclaimed, “to Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return, Ḥābis al-Yemānī is with them, O Amīr al-Mu’mīnīn, he has the sign of Mu‘āwiyah. By Allah, I always assumed him to be a believer!” ‘Alī replied, “and now he is still a believer. Ḥābis was from the people of Yemen, people of piety and exertion in worship.”

‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Abī ‘Awn did not hear from ‘Alī عليه السلام therefore the chain is also interrupted.

‘Alī عليه السلام did not charge the Khawārij with disbelief, despite what they were on in deviation and violating the religion and warmongering, then it is more deserving that he does not declare disbelief on those who rebelled against him.

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta’ẓīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (361):

‘Alī took responsibility for fighting the people who rebelled, and he narrated from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم regarding them all that he narrates, and he called them believers, and ruled them with the laws of the believers, and likewise ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir.

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Taʿzīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (361) by way of Qays ibn Muslim — from Ṭāriq ibn Shihāb who said:

I was with ʿAlī when the fighting ended at Nahrawān and it was said to him, “are they polytheists?” to which he replied, “it was polytheism from which they fled.” Then it was said, “hypocrites?” and he responded, “hypocrites do not remember Allah, except a little.” Then it was asked what they were and he replied, “a group of people who rebelled against us and we fought them.”¹

Ibn Abī Shaybah (37854), ʿAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad in *al-Sunnah* (1283), al-Balādhurī in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (5/58) and Ibn ʿAsākir in his *Tārīkh* (59/61) all narrate by way of Mujālid — from al-Shaʿbī — from al-Ḥārith — from ʿAlī رضي الله عنه who said:

Do not despise the leadership of Muʿāwiyah for if you missed him you would have seen heads falling from their shoulders as if they were the fruit of Ḥanzāl [a bitter fruit].

Al-Ḥārith al-Aʿwar is abandoned and Mujālid ibn Saʿīd is not strong.

Al-Qurṭubī has mentioned:

Whoever has bad feelings towards some of the Ṣaḥābah — may Allah be pleased on them all — for reasons other than which we have described, but for some other reason or incident which occurred like not going against a view, or harm caused etc., he will not be a disbeliever or a hypocrite for that reason, because great differences did arise among them, and bloody wars, and despite that they did not call each other disbelievers, and neither did they accuse each other of hypocrisy for what happened between them. Instead their situation was like that of Mujtahids in legal rulings. Either they were all correct in what was apparent before them, or one party was correct, and the one who erred is excused, rather he is expected to

¹ This chain is authentic.

act according to where he expects to be rewarded. And whoever finds bitterness towards them on account of any of this, then he is a sinner and it is necessary for him to repent from that and to exert himself to overcome his desires to eliminate all these feelings. He can do this by abundantly reminding himself about their virtues, and that they are the predecessors and that they have a right in terms of this world and the next over those who came after them, Since no good has come to anyone after them, whether be in terms of the worldly affairs or those of the hereafter has only come on account of their efforts, and all favours and blessings have come on their account and likewise the harms and disasters were warded off on their account. And for one to hate those who were a means of benefit in this world and the next is in essence a display of ingratitude.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah said in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/394):

... and for this reason the Ahl al-Sunnah are unanimous that neither party can be described with violating religious and moral integrity, even if it is said of one of them that they are transgressors. That is because they were Muta'awwil and Mujtahid, and the Mujtahid who errs is not a disbeliever nor one without integrity; and if they intentionally rebelled then they committed a sin, and the evil effects of sins are lifted by a number of means.

Al-Dhahabī said in *Siyyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* (12/510) regarding the narration, “it is the covenant of the unlettered Prophet with me that none shall love me except a believer and none shall hate me except a hypocrite”²:

1 See *Umdat al-Qārī* (1/152)

2 Even though al-Dhahabī considered this narration problematic since some people of no character loved him in excess and some from the Nawāṣib hated him. The editor has placed a footnote saying: “There is no problem since the intended love is the love sanctioned by the sharī'ah, that which is considered before Allah, as for the love that encompasses those trials and disasters there is no consideration for it, in fact it is a disease upon the one who exceeds in his love as did the Christians with 'Īsā عليه السلام.”

Its meaning is that the love of ‘Alī عليه السلام is from the faith, and hatred towards him is from hypocrisy; and faith is of many branches and likewise is hypocrisy. So a person with intellect will know that merely loving him does not mean a person is a believer in the absolute sense, and in contrast merely disliking him does not cause a monotheist to be an absolute hypocrite. Therefore, one who loves him and hates Abū Bakr will be in the same category of one who hates him and loves Abū Bakr. So hatred of both of them is misguidance and hypocrisy; and loving both of them is guidance and faith.”

He said in his book *al-Kabā’ir* (413):

If the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said this in favour of ‘Alī عليه السلام, then Abū Bakr is more deserving since he is the best of creation after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, and the practice of ‘Umar and ‘Alī عليه السلام was to punish a person who preferred anyone over al-Ṣiddīq عليه السلام, his punishment would be eighty lashes.

Chapter Two

Responding to the Narrations That Have Been Declared Weak, Which Indicate Virtue for Mu‘āwiyah

There are a number of narrations which have come in praise of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and mention his virtue, some of these appear in the authentic collections of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, which have been discredited. The person who has dismissed these narrations has gone out of his way to discredit these reports; however he has not come with anything substantial.

It has been said of Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah that he said:

There exists no authentic narration from the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم regarding the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.

Some scholars followed him on this.

The response to that is as follows:

Firstly, many verses, narrations and statements from the early Muslims have come in praise for the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم and these texts are of two kinds:

1. Those which indicate praise for the Ṣaḥābah in general; which would undoubtedly include Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, and why not; when Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه has expressly mentioned his companionship.

Al-Bukhārī reports in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (3764) by way of ‘Uthmān ibn al-Aswad — from Ibn Abī Mulaykah, who said:

Mu‘āwiyah prayed one rak‘ah of Witr prayer after ‘Ishā; and a bondsman of Ibn ‘Abbās was with him. So he went to Ibn ‘Abbās (and told him of what

happened) and he (Ibn ‘Abbās) said: “Leave him; for he is indeed a Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger ﷺ.”

Al-Bukhārī also reports in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (3766) from Ḥumrān ibn Abān, who narrates from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he said:

Indeed you perform a Prayer; and I have been a Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger ﷺ, and we have not seen him pray it. Actually, he prohibited it — meaning — the two rak‘at after ‘Aṣr.

In *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* it has been reported from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه that he said:

What can be said of people who narrate from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; whereas we had seen him and accompanied him yet we did not hear that from him...

Al-Khallāl mentions in *al-Sunnah* (2/432) (653) from Muḥannā, who said:

I asked Aḥmad regarding Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and he said: “He is a companion.” And I asked where he was from; and Aḥmad responded: “He is a Makkan who took up residence in al-Shām.” – the chain is authentic.”

2. Those narrations and reports which mention the virtues of specific Ṣaḥābah; and among those are the narrations which mention Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه specifically. These shall be mentioned under the section of the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and the praise of the early Muslims for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Secondly, the report from Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah that no authentic narration exists in praise of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, this has been narrated by Ibn al-Jowzī in his collection of fabrications, *al-Mowdhū‘āt* (2/263)(832). He says:

Zāhir ibn Ṭāhir narrated to us — who said — Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī narrated to us — who said — Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim narrated to us — who said — I heard Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qub ibn Yūsuf saying

— I heard my father saying — I heard Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah saying: “There exists no authentic narration regarding the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.”

Al-Suyūṭī has quoted this in *al-La‘ālī al-Maṣnū‘ah* (1/388), as well as Ibn ‘Arrāq al-Kinānī in *Tanzīh al-Sharī‘ah* (2/7) as well as al-Shawkānī in *al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah* (407).

Assuming that this report is sound, the response to it is as follows:

1. There are other scholars who have mentioned narrations with the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and they have declared them authentic. Through this, they have opposed the view that no authentic narration exists regarding the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah. Among these scholars are:

- » Al-Ājurī in his book *al-Sharī‘ah* (5/1524) he collected narrations from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم under the chapter of the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
- » Ibn ‘Asākir in his book *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/79).
- » Al-Dhahabī in his encyclopaedia of biographies, *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/350) as he mentioned a number of narrations regarding Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and concluded with the remark, “these narrations are fair.”
- » Ibn Kathīr in his *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/409) commented – after listing the various narrations on the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

We shall suffice ourselves to the authentic and sound narrations that we have listed without resorting to those which are fabricated or extremely unreliable.

In his comment on the narration, “O Allah, make him a guide, rightly-guided and guide (others) through him,” in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/408), he said:

Ibn ‘Asākir has paid careful attention to this narration and studied it with detail and he has discussed it at great length and excelled and benefitted

in his research; and has been excellent in his criticism, may Allah have mercy on him. How many a place he has displayed his excellence above other scholars!

» Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī in *Taṭhīr al-Janān* (11).¹

2. Those scholars who held that opinion (that no authentic narration exists on the virtue of Mu'āwiyah), no doubt they still consider him to be included in the general texts which praise the Ṣaḥābah and mention their virtue. Contrary to those who pen tens of pages, and deliver sermons and lectures, attempting to authenticate fabrications about Mu'āwiyah; and dismissing authentic narrations regarding his noble status.

What they mean when they say, “no authentic narration exists,” is that no narration that specifically mentions his virtue on an individual basis. As for him being included in the general texts which mention praise and virtue, undoubtedly he is included. One such scholar who upheld this view was Ibn 'Abd al-Barr. Notwithstanding this stance, we find Ibn 'Abd al-Barr transmitting the *Ijmā'* scholarly consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah on the integrity of all the Ṣaḥābah in his book *al-Istī'āb fī Ma'rifat al-Aṣḥāb* (23). He says:

It is well-known that one, by whose statement rulings are given, and by whose testimony judgement is given; then no doubt it is necessary to be aware of such a person's name, lineage, moral and religious integrity, and position with regards to knowledge. With regards to the Ṣaḥābah, even though we have been sufficed the duty of researching them on account of the *ijmā'* of the scholars of the religion, the Ahl al-Sunnah; that all the

1 See how he reconciles the statement of Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah with the manner in which al-Bukhārī has phrased his chapter heading, it appears in the biographical details of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid, Abū 'Umar, the linguist and ascetic, better known as the “Ghulām of Tha'lab” (d. 345 A.H), that the nobles and literature enthusiasts when they would come to him for lessons from the books of Tha'lab, he used to have a collection in which he compiled the narrations of the virtues of Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام that he would insist be read before other books. See *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* (3/192).

Ṣaḥābah are of high religious and moral integrity. However, it is our duty to be familiar with their names and be acquainted with their lives and history so that we may follow their guidance and tread their path.

Likewise, Ibn al-Qayyim, in *al-Manār al-Munīf* (93), after mentioning the statement from Iṣḥāq ibn Rāhūyah, says:

What he intends, and what all the scholars of ḥadīth who uphold this view intend by it is that there is no specific narration indicating his virtue on an individual level. However, all the authentic narrations regarding the status of the Ṣaḥābah — may Allah be pleased with them all — and that of the Quraysh, all include Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Al-Mu'allimī said in *al-Anwār al-Kāshifah* (92):

This does not negate the authentic narrations which include him, and others besides him. Neither does it mean that all that has been narrated regarding his virtues is necessarily a forgery.

Ibn al-Qayyim said in *al-Manār al-Munīf* (94), regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

Every disparaging narration regarding him is an invented lie.

3. Thirdly, if this is established from those scholars then this is a praise for the Ṣaḥābah and an exposition of their integrity; and likewise a praise for Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and a clear indicator of his honesty and status since none of the Ṣaḥābah invented any narration in favour of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. It shows his integrity and honesty since he, like them, did not invent any narration in his own favour; neither did he enlist anyone to do the same.

Al-Mu'allimī said in *al-Anwār al-Kāshifah* (92):

As for the matter of the Ṣaḥābah then it is absolutely clear that there is no room for accusing them of lying against the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم.

Consider that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه governed al-Shām for twenty years, and he was the khalīfah for a further twenty years. From those who were in his camp, and those whose needs centred around him, were a large number of Ṣaḥābah; some of whom accepted Islam after the Conquest of Makkah and some who accepted later on, as well as many of the Bedouin tribes. The incentive to show their partisanship towards him and the reasons to show their allegiance to him were present, and if there was any room for anyone to invent a lie against the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and it would be accepted from such a person then definitely some of them would have done so by forging narrations regarding the status of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Actually, those Ṣaḥābah would have publicly narrated such narrations to get in favour with Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and these would have been transmitted by the generation of the Tābi'īn and this would have been passed on from one generation to the next and accepted as truth.

Therefore, if the view of there being no established narration existing were true, then it would be an indicator towards the truthfulness and integrity of the Ṣaḥābah in terms of what they narrate. Yet there were none of them, regardless of their position, or however strong the incentive was, who ever attempted lying against the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم; and likewise Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Assuming that he allowed lying against the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم as long as it was in his favour and that others were not prepared to invent the lie; then it was within his capacity to invent a lie from his own side since many a Ṣaḥābī besides him narrated from the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم their own virtues. The people accepted these narrations from them and the scholars narrated it afterwards. So in this matter there is an indicator that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was on a level of honesty and integrity that prevented him from even considering inventing lies, or employing others to invent lies against the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, no matter how pressing the need was. If one considers this carefully, one will realise that the fact that scholars do not consider any such narration to exist, on the specific virtues of Mu'āwiyah, is a greater indicator of his virtue than the existence of such a narration.

The First Narration

O Allah, make him a guide, rightly-guided and guide (others) through him.

This narration has been narrated by al-Bukhārī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240), al-Tirmidhī in his *Jāmi‘* (3843), Ibn Sa‘d in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/417), al-Ṭabarānī in *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (2198), Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharī‘ah* (1914,1915) and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in his *Tārīkh* (1/207). All of them by way of Abū Mus-hir — from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz — from Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah.

It has also been narrated by Aḥmad in is *Musnad* (17929), Ibn Abī Khaythamah in his *Tārīkh* (1233), Abū Nu‘aym in *al-Hilyah* (8/358) by way of al-Walīd ibn Muslim — from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz with the same chain.

It has also been narrated by al-Bukhārī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240), Abū Nu‘aym in *Akhbār Aṣbiḥān* (1/180), Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), al-Baghawī in *Mu‘jam al-Ṣaḥābah* (4/490) by way of Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāṭirī — from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz with the same chain.

It has also been narrated by al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (656), and *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (707), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (1/451) by way of al-Walīd ibn Muslim — from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz — from Yūnus ibn Maysarah — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah.

It has also been narrated by al-Baghawī in *Mu‘jam al-Ṣaḥābah* (5/367), Ibn ‘Asākir in his *Tārīkh* (59/86) by way of Hishām ibn ‘Ammār — from Abū Sā‘ib ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn al-Walīd ibn Sulaymān — from his father, mentioning from ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ... and this chain is interrupted¹, since al-Walīd ibn Sulaymān did not meet ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.

1 See *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (5/122) and *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/409).

Al-Tirmidhī also narrates it in his *Jāmi‘* (3843) and Abū Nu‘aym, both by way of ‘Amr ibn Wāqīd — from Yūnus ibn Maysarah — from Abū Idrīs — from ‘Umayr ibn Sa‘d. Al-Tirmidhī commented after it:

This ḥadīth is Gharīb, and ‘Amr ibn Wāqīd is considered weak.

This narration has been discredited on account of unsubstantiated defects!!!¹

The First Alleged Defect

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah, his narrations are not established and neither has his companionship of the Messenger ﷺ been confirmed; and he best resembles a *majhūl* (unknown). Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said: “His narrations are irreconcilable, his companionship cannot be established, he is from al-Shām.”

The response to this is that the companionship of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah is established on the basis of two aspects:

1. In some versions of this narration, he expressly mentions that he heard it from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; and this proves his rank as a Ṣaḥābī.

The express mention of having heard it from the Messenger ﷺ is found in the narration of al-Bukhārī’s *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240), al-Bukhārī said of him:

He is considered from the people of al-Shām. Abū Mus-hir said: “‘Abd Allāh ibn Marwān related from Sa‘d — from Rabī‘ah that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān heard from the Prophet ﷺ.

1 Ḥasan Farḥān al-Mālīkī has discredited this narration on the basis of certain alleged defects. The author is going to address these alleged defects and disprove them systematically. – [Translator]

The explicit mention of ‘hearing’ is also found in *al-Sharīḥ* (1915) of al-Ājurrī by way of Abū Mus-hir — from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz with the above chain; and in the *Tārīkh* of Ibn ʿAsākir (59/83) by way of Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥarrānī — from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz with the above chain.

So there is no basis for denying his rank as a Ṣaḥābī after him explicitly saying he heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.

Ibn Ḥajar said in *al-Iṣābah* (4/342):

Suppose that this narration that Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr has indicated to, appears to be defective due to an interruption that seems to be there; what will he do with the rest of the narrations which clearly state that he heard it from the Prophet ﷺ?! What could be a greater confirmation of his rank as a Ṣaḥābī than this?

2. Majority of the scholars are of the opinion that his companionship is well established. In fact, nobody is known to deny this fact besides Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr; and Ibn Ḥajar was astonished by this as has been shown from the quote of *al-Iṣābah* (4/342).

From those scholars who confirmed his rank as a Ṣaḥābī are:

- » Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal, since he narrates this ḥadīth in his *Musnad* (17929) from the narration of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah and that indicates that he considers him to be a Ṣaḥābī. If this were not the case he would have not included this narration since it would be Mursal and not Musnad.
- » Al-Bukhārī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240) said of him: “He is considered from the people of al-Shām. Abū Mus-hir said: “ʿAbd Allāh ibn Marwān related from Saʿīd — from Rabīʿah that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān heard from the Prophet ﷺ.”

- » Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Tanūkhī — one of the narrators of this ḥadīth from him — as it appears in *Jāmiʿ al-Tirmidhī* (3842), *Tārīkh ibn Abī Khaythamah* (1/350), *Tārīkh Dimashq* of Ibn ʿAsākir (35/230) by way of Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz — from Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd — from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah and he was from the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ.
- » Ibn Saʿd, in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/417), said regarding him: “Al-Muzanī, he was from the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ; he settled in al-Shām.”
- » Al-Mizzī, in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (17/321), said regarding him: “Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah al-Muzanī, and it is also said al-Azdī al-Barnī. However this is a mistake since he is a Muzanī and not an Azdī; he is the brother of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayrah. He settled in Ḥimṣ, and he had narrated from the Prophet ﷺ.”
- » Ibn ʿAsākir, in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (35/229), writes: “Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah al-Muzanī, and it has been said al-Azdī, the brother of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayrah. He was a Ṣaḥābī.”
- » Ibn Ḥajar, in *al-Iṣābah* (4/342), states: “... and these narration even though every chain of transmission of them is not free from a statement (of criticism), the collective corroboration of them firmly establishes that status of companionship for ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.”
- » Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Sakan, Ibn al-Barqī, Ibn Ḥibbān, ʿAbd al-Ṣamad ibn Saʿīd and Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Samīʿ all mention him among the Ṣaḥābah according to whom Ibn Ḥajar writes in *al-Iṣābah* (4/342): “Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and Ibn al-Sakan said, “he has companionship, and al-Bukhārī, Ibn Saʿd, Ibn al-Barqī, Ibn Ḥibbān, ʿAbd al-Ṣamad ibn Saʿīd and Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Samīʿ all mention him from the Ṣaḥābah.”

The Second Alledged Defect

Ibn Abī Ḥātim has transmitted, in his *ʿIlal* (2/363) — from his father that Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah did not hear this narration from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Instead he narrated it from Muʿāwiyah — from the Prophet ﷺ.

I say that Ibn Abī Ḥātim has been mistaken in what he mentions of Abū Mus-hir, and Marwān ibn Muḥammad, that they both narrate the report by way of Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah — from Muʿāwiyah ﷺ himself since all the variant chains narrated by Abū Mus-hir and Marwān do not mention Muʿāwiyah.¹

The narration of Abū Mus-hir has been narrated by al-Bukhārī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240), Ibn Saʿd in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/417), al-Tirmidhī in his *Jāmiʿ* (3843), al-Ṭabarānī in *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (2198), Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharīʿah* (1914,1915), al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in his *Tārīkh* (1/207), all of them by way of Abū Mus-hir — from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz — from Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd — from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah; and there is absolutely no mention of Muʿāwiyah ﷺ.

The narration of Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāṭarī has been narrated by Abū Nuʿaym in *Akhbār Aṣbiḥān* (1/180), and Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), both of them by way of Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāṭarī — from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz with the same chain, neither does it have any mention of Muʿāwiyah ﷺ.

The Third Alledged Defect

The student of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah and the teacher of Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz is possibly — but not certain — to be Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī... He is extremely weak more so after his Nāṣibī sentiments became apparent, and it is he of whom Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr said: “He was from the

1 Al-Mālikī mentions this himself in his book pg. 155.

Nāṣibī, he used to curse ‘Alī,” and Abū Ḥātim said: “He is not to be narrated from, and no honour is lost in that.”

The response to this is from two perspectives:

1. Who of the scholars of ḥadīth considered that Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz narrates from Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī al-Nāṣibī?
2. There has been a difference among the scholars regarding Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī whether he was a Ṣaḥābī or not; as some of them have clearly stated this. Among them:
 - Al-Bukhārī, in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (3/280), said: “Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī, he has companionship...”
 - Ibn Ḥibbān, in *al-Thiqāt* (3/129), said: “Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī, it is said that he was a Ṣaḥābī...”
 - Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* (3/472), said: “Some people say that he was a Ṣaḥābī, I heard my father saying this.”
 - Ibn Ḥajar, in *al-Iṣābah* (2/477), said: “Al-‘Askarī said that some of them said that he had companionship... Ibn Faṭḥūn, Abū ‘Alī al-Ghassānī and Ibn Mi‘waz ‘Alī Abū ‘Umar have emended him (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr) relying on the statement of al-Bukhārī.”

The Fourth Alledged Defect

Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dimashqī, notwithstanding the fact that he is well established, from the narrators of Muslim and the Sunan works, well-revered by the people of Shām, he became confused at the end of his life.

This will be responded to from two perspectives, and with Allah is success:

1. Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dimashqī did get confused towards the end of his years.

However, in one of the numerous chains of narration from him the narrator from him is Abu Mus-hir ‘Abd al-A‘lā ibn Mus-hir, as is found in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (5/240), Ibn Sa‘d in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/417), al-Tirmidhī in *al-Jāmi‘* (3843), al-Ṭabarānī in *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (2198), Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharī‘ah* (1914,1915), and al-Khaṭīb in his *Tārīkh* (1/207). Abū Mus-hir is among those who narrated from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz early on and he would elevate him. He would say: “Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz vies with al-Awzā‘ī.” How could he consider him an equal of al-Awzā‘ī if he narrated after his lapse?

2. Abū Mus-hir did not narrate from Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz in isolation, there are four others who have also narrated it from Sa‘īd and it is farfetched to think that they would all have narrated from him after his confusion and memory lapse. They are as follows:

- » Al-Walīd ibn Muslim al-Dimishqī as found in *Musnad Aḥmad* (17929), Abū Nu‘aym in *al-Ḥilyah* (8/358), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* and *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (606), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/451).
- » Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāṭarī as found in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (5/240), Abū Nu‘aym in *Akhbār Asbihān* (1/180), and Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129).
- » ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid, as is found in *al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl (2/450), and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/83).
- » Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥarrānī as found in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/83).²

The Fifth Alleged Defect

The occasion of the narration, as they mention of Rabī‘ah the teacher of

1 *al-Jarḥ wal-Ta’dīl* (1/287)

2 Also see *al-Silsilah al-Ṣaḥīḥah* of al-Albānī (4/615)

Saʿīd, was when ʿUthmān¹ dismissed ʿUmayr ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī from the governorship of Ḥimṣ and nominated Muʿāwiyah in his stead. ʿUthmān dismissed him (ʿUmayr) early, 24 A.H, and Rabīʿah, the narrator of the incident and the ḥadīth only died after 120 A.H meaning that between him and the incident there is a period of almost one hundred years and the gap is evident between Rabīʿah and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Umayrah.

The response to this is as follows:

1. Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd has been corroborated on this narration from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah and does not narrate it in isolation. He is corroborated by Yūnus ibn Maysarah as it appears in *al-Awsaṭ* (656) and *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (606) of al-Ṭabarānī, and *al-Sunnah* (2/451) of al-Khallāl.
2. Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd clearly states to have heard it from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah, and he in turn clearly states that he heard it from the Prophet ﷺ as in *al-Tārikh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (5/240). So where is the gap or interruption?
3. The incident regarding the occasion of mentioning the ḥadīth is not reliable. *Al-Tirmidhī* (3843) narrates it and says: “Gharīb, and ʿAmr ibn Wāqīd is considered weak.”

The Sixth Alledged Defect

The inconsistency regarding ibn Abī ʿUmayrah, sometimes they say ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Umayrah, and other times they say ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn ʿUmayrah, sometimes al-Muzanī, and others al-Anṣārī etc. ... all of which imply the unknown status of this person.

I say: this purported defect has been dealt with in previous responses, which suffices from repeating it here.

1 As such it appears in the *Tārikh* of Ibn ʿAsākir (59/81) and the one who dismissed ʿUmayr ibn Saʿd was ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as in *al-Tirmidhī* (3843) and he said after it: “This narration is Gharīb; and ʿAmr ibn Wāqīd is considered weak.”

The Seventh Alledged Defect

They have narrated it from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz — from Rabīʿah at times and others from Yūnus ibn Maysarah — and perhaps this — if it is correct — is from the confusion of Saʿīd also.

The Eighth Alledged Defect

They narrate it from Saʿīd — from Rabīʿah — from Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah at times; and others from Saʿīd — from Rabīʿah — from Abū Idrīs — from Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah. Perhaps this is from Saʿīd's confusion and memory lapse as well.

The Ninth Alledged Defect

Sometimes there is one person between Saʿīd and Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah, sometimes two, and other times the narration is from him directly. Perhaps this came about on account of the confusion of Saʿīd.

I say: these defects revolve on *Iḍṭirāb* (internal contradiction and inconsistency). However, this *Iḍṭirāb* is not such that it affects the reliability of the narration, as the correct chain for this narration is from Saʿīd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz — from Rabīʿah ibn Yazīd — from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah; and this is the narration of the majority. It has been narrated as such by:

- » Al-Walīd ibn Muslim al-Dimishqī as in *Musnad Aḥmad* (17929), Abū Nuʿaym in *al-Hilyah* (8/358), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (656) and *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (606), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/451).
- » Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭaṭarī as in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (5/240), Abū Nuʿaym in *Akhbār Asbihān* (1/180), and Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129).
- » ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Wāḥid, as is found in *al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl (2/450), and Ibn ʿAsākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/83).

- » Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥarrānī as found in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/83).
- » Abu Mus-hir, as is found in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (5/240), Ibn Sa’d in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (7/417), al-Tirmidhī in *al-Jāmi‘* (3843), al-Ṭabarānī in *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (2198), Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim in *al-Āḥād wa l-Mathānī* (3129), al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharī‘ah* (1914,1915), and al-Khaṭīb in his *Tārīkh* (1/207).

All five of them narrate it from Sa‘īd Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz — from Rabī‘ah ibn Yazīd — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah. Therefore Ibn ‘Asākir says in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/84): “The view of the majority is correct”, al-Albānī says in *al-Ṣaḥīḥah* (4/616) of this Iḍṭirāb: “It is not from the kind that affects the reliability of the narration since the inconsistent variants are not of matching strength (hence not irreconcilable).”

The Second Narration

The narration of Umm Ḥarām regarding the naval expedition, narrated by al-Bukhārī (2766) by way of Thowr ibn Yazīd — from Khālīd ibn Ma’dān that ‘Umayr ibn al-Aswad al-‘Ansī told him that he went to ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit while he was staying in his house at the coast of Ḥimṣ with (his wife) Umm Ḥarām. ‘Umayr said:

Umm Ḥarām informed us that she heard the Prophet ﷺ saying: “The first army from my followers who will undertake a naval expedition have made (Jannah) compulsory (upon themselves).” Umm Ḥarām added, “I said, ‘O Messenger of Allah ﷺ, will I be amongst them?’ He replied, ‘you are amongst them.’ The Prophet ﷺ then said, ‘the first army amongst my followers who will invade the city of Caesar will be forgiven.’ I asked, ‘will I be one of them, O Messenger of Allah ﷺ?’ He replied, ‘no.’”

This narration contains within it a great merit and virtue for Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه since the first naval expedition that was undertaken by this ummah

was under the command of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and the first to undertake a naval expedition was Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه during the reign of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.¹

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fath* (6/120):

Al-Muhallab said: “In this ḥadīth there is a merit of Mu‘āwiyah since he was the first to undertake a naval expedition.”

He says further (6/121):

The statement, “they have made it compulsory,” means they have done such an action, on account of which Jannah has been made compulsory for them.

Al-Munāwī says in *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* (3/83):

... meaning they have done such an action that made Jannah compulsory for them; or they have brought upon themselves forgiveness and mercy.

Despite all of this, the above narration which has been recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* has not been spared from criticism for no reason other than it bearing a merit for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Let us examine the alleged defects and provide the explanations in response to them.

The First Alleged Defect

Shudhūdh (the contradiction of a reliable narrator of that which is more weightier), the narration is considered *Shādh* by them; and the correct version is the ‘other stronger wording’.

It is that which is narrated by al-Bukhārī (2636) and Muslim (5925) from Anas ibn Malik رضي الله عنه — from his maternal aunt — Umm Ḥarām bint Maḥḥān

¹ See *al-Fath* 11/75

ﷺ who said: “The Prophet ﷺ once slept in my house near to me and got up smiling. I said, ‘what makes you smile?’ He replied, ‘some of my followers who were presented to me sailing on this green sea like kings on thrones.’ I said, ‘O Messenger of Allah ﷺ, ask Allah to make me one of them.’” So the Prophet ﷺ supplicated to Allah for her and went to sleep again. He did the same (i.e. got up and told his dream) and Umm Ḥarām repeated her question and he gave the same reply. She said, “supplicate to Allah to make me one of them.” He said, “you are among the first group.” Later on it happened that she went out with her husband ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه (for Jihād) and it was the first time the Muslims undertook a naval expedition, led by Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. When the expedition came to an end and they were returning to al-Shām, an animal was presented to her to ride, but the animal let her fall and thus she passed away.”

This can be responded to with a number of responses:

1. None have said that the narration is Shādh. Who are the scholars of ḥadīth who have said this?
2. Assuming that the wording of the first narration is Shādh, and that the second narration is stronger and sound; it still indicates the merit of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Al-Lālakāṭī has listed this narration in *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (8/1524) under the chapter of what has been narrated from the Prophet ﷺ regarding the virtues and merits of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, in *al-Tamhīd* (1/235) says:

... in it is the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah since it was under his flag that the first expedition was undertaken; and the dreams of the ambiyā’ are revelation.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fatḥ* (11/73):

The statement, “people from my followers have been presented to me as warriors,” this implies that his smiling was on account of being impressed

and pleased with them; especially due him seeing them on such a lofty position.

The Second Alleged Defect

The narration has been declared defective on account of the narrators appearing in it all being Nāṣībīs.

I say: Firstly it is necessary to clarify the aspect of the narration of the people of innovation¹. The correct view in this matter — and Allah knows best — is that the narration of an innovator is accepted without restriction even if such a person is one who invites to his views as long as the narrator is reliable himself; and his innovation is not one that results in disbelief.

This matter is one of difference of opinion among the scholars.

Opinions of the Scholars Regarding Narrating From the People of Innovation

The First Opinion

The narrations of innovators are to be rejected without exception. This view has been attributed to Imām Mālik and Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī², since narrating from such people results in promoting their affair and praiseworthy mention of

1 Al-Mālikī's views, and application, of this matter is shockingly inconsistent and self-contradictory. If the narrator is a Shī'ī then his narrations are accepted even if it is in support of his innovation. However, if the narrator is a Nāṣībī his narrations are subject to severe criticism even though he might be from the most reliable of narrators. The examples of this are many, among them: Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim is a Rāfiḍī, abandoned in ḥadīth; despite this his narrations are considered strong! Talīd ibn Sulaymān is a Rāfiḍī and a confounded liar; yet he deems him to be strong. On the other hand he criticises Rabī'ah ibn Yazīd al-Dimishqī, Sa'īd ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dimishqī, Thowr ibn Yazīd, Khālīd ibn Mī'dān and 'Umayr ibn al-Aswad despite them being reliable narrators, from whom the entire six narrate.

2 See *Fath al-Mughīth* 3/60 of al-Sakhāwī, and *al-Tankīl* 1/45 of al-Mu'allimī.

them. Al-Khaṭīb says in *al-Kifāyah* (148):

The scholars have differed regarding hearing ḥadīth from the people of innovation like the Qadariyyah, Khawārij, Rāfiḍah, and upon relying on, and acceptance of their narrations. Some of the early scholars have prohibited this since they are considered disbelievers according to those who pronounce disbelief on the people of taʿwīl, and they are considered flagrant sinners according to those who do not pronounce disbelief on the people of taʿwīl. Among those who held this view was Mālik ibn Anas.

Ibn Ḥajar said in *Lisān al-Mizān* (1/10):

The prohibition of accepting the narration of the innovators who have not crossed the line into disbelief like the Rāfiḍah and Khawārij and their like is the view of Mālik and his companions; and Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī and his followers.

Ibn Ṣalāḥ rebutted this view in *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* (104):

The view of unrestricted prohibition is farfetched from the scholars of ḥadīth since their books are filled with narrations of people of innovation who did not invite.

Among those who held this view was Abū Ishāq, Ibrāhīm ibn Yaʿqūb al-Jūzajānī, especially those who were described as being Shīʿī. He would reject the narrations of those being described as such with the exception of a few narrators whose popularity was on the basis of their excellent memories, precision and trustworthiness. Al-Dhahabī says in *al-Mizān* (2/66):

Abū Ishāq al-Jūzajānī's expressions are harsh and that is his habit...

Al-Muʿallimī said in his *Tankīl* (1/46):

Al-Jūzajānī has the tendency of Naṣb and he is hell-bent on criticism of narrators with Shīʿī tendencies.¹

1 See *Sharḥ al-ʿIlal* of Ibn Rajab 1/357; and *al-Thiqāt* 8/82; and *al-Kāmil* 1/310; and *al-Tankīl* 1/99

The Second Opinion

This view is one of distinction and detail. If the narrator is such that he invites to his innovation, his narrations shall not be accepted. However, if he was not a caller to his innovation his narration would be accepted (provided that he was reliable and accurate). This is the view of the majority of the scholars.

Al-Khaṭīb attributed this view to Imām Aḥmad and narrated it with his complete chain to Ibn Maḥdī and Ibn al-Mubārak. Aḥmad said of Shabābah ibn Sawwār: “I abandoned him and did not write from him on account his Irjā,” so it was said to Aḥmad, ‘what about Abū Mu‘āwiyah?’ He responded, ‘Shabābah was a caller.’”¹

Al-Khaṭīb says in *al-Kifāyah* (149):

Many scholars have said the narrations of those who do not call to innovation are accepted. As for those who call to their innovation then they are not to be relied upon and among those who adopted this view was Abū Abd-Allah Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal.

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Maḥdī said:

Whoever held any such view but did not invite to it would be considered; as for one who invited to his views he deserves to be abandoned.²

‘Alī ibn Ḥasan ibn Shaqīq said:

I said to ‘Abd Allāh — referring to Ibn al-Mubārak — have you heard from ‘Amr ibn ‘Ubayd? And he indicated with his hand ‘plenty’, so I asked him why do you not name him whereas you name others from the Qadariyyah? He replied, “it is because he was a leader among them.”³

1 See *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* 1/301, and *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/147

2 *Al-Kifāyah* (155)

3 *Al-Kifāyah* (155); *al-Siyar* 8/302

Al-Nawawī said in *al-Taqrīb* (43):

This is the preferred view and the most balanced of views and the view adopted by the majority.

Ibn Ṣalāḥ said in *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* (104):

This is the most balanced of the views and the preferred one.

Ibn Kathīr mentioned in *Ikhtīṣār ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth* (1/299):

... and that which the majority are upon is the view of distinguishing between those who were callers and those who were not.

In fact, Ibn Ḥibbān had transmitted the widespread unanimity of this view. He said under the biography of Jaʿfar ibn Sulaymān al-Ḍabī in *al-Thiqāt* (6/140):

Jaʿfar ibn Sulaymān is from the reliable narrators of ḥadīth whose narrations are accurate and precise; except that he was inclined towards the Ahl al-Bayt but did not invite towards his views. There is no disagreement among our scholars of ḥadīth that the trustworthy narrator who is accurate in what he narrates; if he has some innovation but does not invite to it, his narrations are accepted and relied upon. However, if he calls to his innovation then he is not to be relied upon. It is for this reason that they abandoned¹ the narrations of a group of them who adopted innovations and called towards them even though they were reliable. Our acceptance of reliable narrators who have adopted the same views of others is on account of them not being callers to their innovation. Whatever view the slave adopts is between him and his Master; if He wishes He will punish them and if He wishes He will pardon them. It is upon us to accept their narrations if they are reliable according to what we have mentioned in more than one place in our books.²

1 The author has pointed out an error in the printed version of the book he is quoting from.

2 See also *al-Mujrūḥīn* 1/18

Al-Ḥākim has also transmitted the agreement of the scholars on this matter.¹

Al-Dhahabī said in *al-Mughnī* (1/523) with slight paraphrasing:

... As for the extremists and those who invited to their way; majority of the early scholars warned against them and would not narrate from them.

In *al-Mīzān* (2/6), under the biography of Dāwūd ibn al-Ḥuṣayn, he stated:

Ibn Ḥibbān said that he was one of the *Shurāt*² — meaning *Khawārij* — like ‘Ikrimah. However, he was not a caller of that way. As for the callers, it is necessary to avoid their narrations.

Ibn Ḥajar, in *Nuzhat al-Nazar* (137), considered strange the transmission of unanimity.³ Some have placed an added limitation that the narration must not be in support of the person’s innovation.

Ibrāhīm ibn Ibrāhīm al-Jūzajānī, in his book *al-Shajarah fī Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl* (32), said of certain narrators:

... among them are those who have veered from the path of truth, but honest in what he narrates, so there is no escape except to accept their narrations which are not objectionable and do not support their innovation.

Ibn Ḥajar said in *Lisān al-Mīzān* (1/11):

It is necessary to restrict our statement of acceptance of the narrations of the innovator if he is trustworthy, and not a caller to his innovation that his narration which he narrates should not be supporting his innovation; for we cannot be sure in that case of his impartiality. And with Allah is success.

1 See *al-Tankīl* 1/43

2 See *al-Farq bayna al-Firaq* (79)

3 See *Hadī al-Sāri* (549)

He said in *al-Nuzhah* (136):

... thereafter the innovation is of two kinds: It either results in disbelief, or it results in major sin. As for the first, the majority will not accept the narrations of such a person. However, further investigation tells us that not every such innovation is to be rejected since every group claims that its opponent is on innovation and on account of exaggeration the other party is deemed to be upon disbelief. So the relied-upon position is that one only rejects the narration of such a person who rejects a mass-narrated narration, the knowledge of which is deemed necessary by the sharī'ah. Likewise; one who believes the opposite. As for the second, those narrations are to be accepted of narrators who do not call to their innovation according to the most sound opinion; except if such a narrator narrates that which supports his innovation, then his narration will be rejected according to the preferred view; and this view has been clearly expressed by al-Jowraqānī, the teacher of al-Nasā'ī.

He said in *Hadī al-Sārī* (549):

This view is the most balanced and has become the adopted position of many of the scholars, in reference to the acceptance of the narrator who does not invite to his innovation.

The Third Opinion

The innovation does not affect the credibility of a narrator as long as he is well-established in terms of his memory, precision of narration, and trustworthiness. This is because his religiousness and honesty will prevent him from lying.¹

This is the view of the majority among the earlier scholars like al-Bukhārī, Muslim, 'Alī ibn al-Madīnī, Yahyā ibn Sa'īd al-Qaṭṭān, Ibn Khuzaymah and others among the scholars of ḥadīth.

1 See *al-Tahdhīb* 3/317; *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 10/357; *Fatḥ al-Mughīth* 2/61

Al-Bukhārī has narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* from ‘Imrān ibn Ḥaṭṭān at one place, where he is corroborated.¹ ‘Imrān ibn Ḥaṭṭān was from the Khawārij. In *al-Hadī* (432), Ibn Ḥajar says: “He was a caller to his way.”²

He also narrates from ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥammānī — and he was a caller to Irjā’ as mentioned by Abū Dāwūd³ — at one place⁴.

Al-Bukhārī (990) narrates — and this is his wording — as well as *Muslim* (215) by way of Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Khālid, from Qays, from ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ who said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying openly and not secretly: “Verily the family of Abū Bayāḍ⁵ (indicating a blank space) — meaning so-and-so — are not my allies. Indeed my only allies are Allah and the righteous of the believers.”⁶

Qays ibn Abī Ḥāzim⁷ is accused of the innovation of Naṣb, and this narration appears to support his innovation yet it is still narrated by al-Bukhārī and Muslim.⁸

1 The chapter of clothing; sub-chapter of wearing silk for men and the amount of which is allowed thereof. Ḥadīth: 5835

2 He said in *al-Fath* 10/357: “Al-Bukhārī brought his narration on the principle that he will narrate from innovators if they are religious and honest.”

3 See *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/487; *Hadī al-Sārī* 1/416

4 Under the chapter of the virtues of Qur’ān, sub-chapter of beautifying ones voice with recitation. Ḥadīth: 4761.

5 Ibn al-Qayyim said in *Jalāl al-Afhām* (255): “... and some of the narrators have erred in this narration by saying, ‘verily the family of Banū Bayāḍ,’ what resulted in their confusion is that it appears in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* as ‘verily the Family of ... are not my allies’ and an empty space (Bayāḍ) was left between ‘Family of’ and ‘are not’ and when the later scribes read the book they assumed the word ‘Bayāḍ’ to be ascribed to the phrase ‘Family of’ and they linked the two. There is no Arab tribe known as Banū Bayāḍ; neither did the Prophet ﷺ say that. Rather, all that was referred to was a big family from the Quraysh, and the correct manner of reading the text is to say the “Family of [Blank]” meaning there is an empty space after the word ‘Family of’; or to say there is a blank spot here.” See also *Fath al-Bārī* (10/515) and al-Nawawī’s commentary of *Muslim* (3/87); and the wording in *Muslim* (215) is: “Verily the Family of – meaning so-and-so ...”

6 See *al-Tahdhīb* 3/444 and *Fath al-Bārī* 10/516

7 See *al-Tahdhīb* 3/444 and *Fath al-Bārī* 10/516

8 See *al-Tankīl* 1/51 of al-Mu’allimī as well as al-Albānī’s comments.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *Fatḥ al-Bārī* (10/515):

Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī says in *Sirāj al-Murīdīn*: “In the original ḥadīth of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ the words were ‘verily the family of Abū Ṭālib’ and it was adjusted to ‘the family of so-and-so’. This is how he mentioned it with assertion. Some people averted him and were harsh in their castigations and accused him of bearing ill-will against the family of Abū Ṭālib. He was free of this evil since the narration that Ibn al-‘Arabī was referring to is found in the *Mustakhrāj* of Abū Nu‘aym by way of al-Faḍl ibn al-Muwaḥḥaq — from ‘Anbasah ibn ‘Abd al-Wāḥid — with the same chain as al-Bukhārī — from Bayān ibn Bishr — from Qays ibn Abī Ḥāzim — from ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ from the Prophet ﷺ: “Verily the Family of Abū Ṭālib have a bond of relation that I maintain.” Al-Ismā‘īlī has a similar narration with the exception of the vagueness at this point; as some of them assumed this belittling the family of Abū Ṭālib; whereas it is not the case.

Furthermore, Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj narrates (237) — from ‘Adī ibn Thābit — from Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh — from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه who said:

Indeed it is the covenant of the unlettered prophet to me that none shall love me except a believer and none shall hate me except a hypocrite.

‘Adī ibn Thābit is a well-known Shī‘ī preacher.

Al-Dhahabī says in *al-Mīzān* (3/61):

‘Adī ibn Thābit is the scholar of the Shī‘ah, their truthful one, their preacher, and the Imām of their Masjid.

Despite this Imām Muslim narrates this narration from him.

Al-Khaṭīb narrates — with his chain — in *al-Kifāyah* (157) — from ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī who said:

I said to Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī said:

“I abandon from the people of ḥadīth all those who were leaders of innovation.” So Yaḥyā laughed and said, “what will he do about Qatādah? What will he do about ‘Umar ibn Thar al-Hamadānī? What about Ibn Abī Rawād?” and Yaḥyā listed a number of names which I have refrained from mentioning. Thereafter Yaḥyā said, “if ‘Abd al-Raḥmān abandons this type, he will abandon much.”¹

Al-Khaṭīb narrates — with his chain — in *al-Kifāyah* (157), from ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī who said:

If I abandon (narration from) the people of Baṣrah on account of Qadr (predestination), and I abandon the people of Kūfah on account of that view — meaning Tashayyū‘ — the books would be ruined.

Al-Khaṭīb said:

His statement, “the books would be ruined,” means that many narrations would be lost.

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Khuzaymah states in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2/376):

‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb — who is suspect in his beliefs but reliable in his narration — narrated to us...

So Ibn Khuzaymah ratified ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb al-Rawājīnī in his narration despite him being suspected of deviated belief.

This opinion is the correct opinion; and Allah knows best.

It has been found to be the situation in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* that there are narrations of some of the people of innovation, and callers to it, but the truthful among them.

¹ See also *al-Sīyar* 5/278

Al-Dhahabī says in *al-Siyar* (7/21):

A group of (narrators) have been smeared with (the erroneous belief regarding) predestination; yet their narrations are in the two *Ṣaḥīḥ*'s or one of them on account of them being described with honesty and precision and accuracy.

Al-Mu'allimī says in *al-Tankīl* (1/50):

... and the scholars of ḥadīth have ratified a group of innovators and relied on their narrations and transmitted them in their authentic collections. One who repeatedly pursues their narrations will find a substantial amount of them that appear to support their innovation; whereas the scholars have an alternative interpretation of those reports without censuring them on account of the innovation of the narrator, nor the narrator on account of what he narrates.

Al-Dhahabī says in *al-Siyar* (7/154):

This is a matter of great significance, i.e. the Qadarī, the Mu'tazilī, the Jahmī, the Rāfiḍī, whose honesty in narration is well known as well as his piety and the fact that he does not invite to his corrupted belief. The majority of the ḥadīth scholars are inclined towards acceptance of his narrations and practicing according to their details. They were less decisive when it came to the matter of one who called to his beliefs; whether his narrations could be accepted or not. Many of the great scholars avoided their narrations and refrained from narrating from them. On the other hand some of them said: "If we are aware of his honesty — even though he is a caller to his corrupt beliefs — and we find with him a sunnah that is not found with others beside him how could we justify abandoning that sunnah." So the manner in which all the scholars conducted themselves seems to indicate that if the corrupted belief of a narrator does not warrant departure from the faith and does not necessitate the spilling of his blood, then it is within plausible means that his narration be acceptable.

This particular matter has not become clear to me as is necessary; and what appears to be the case to me is that a person who is involved in an innovation and is not considered from the forerunners of that particular view; neither does he delve into the details of it; his narrations ought to be accepted.

He says in *al-Mīzān* (1/5) under the biography of Abān ibn Taghlib:

Trustworthy; for us is his honesty and against him is his innovation.¹

Al-Dhahabī also says in *al-Siyar* (19/368) under the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Dāwūd, Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd al-Asdī:

“The reliance in all of that is the honesty of the Muslim narrator; if he is one of innovation, (narration) will be taken from him; although it would be better to avoid him. It is necessary not to take (narration) from one who is known with major sin.

He says further in *al-Siyar* (13/395) under the biography of Muhammad ibn al-Faraj ibn Maḥmūd al-Azraq al-Baghdādī:

He has the example of many of the reliable narrators in either one or both the Ṣaḥīḥ books who had subtle innovation or perhaps a more defined form of it; what is the way around it? We ask Allah for pardon and clemency.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *Lisān al-Mīzān* (1/10):

The abstaining from accepting the reports of a narrator described with innovation, whose innovation does not result in departure from the religion is a view adopted by Imām Mālik, and his companions, and al-Bāqillānī and his followers. The unrestricted acceptance of those whose innovation is not tantamount to heresy and whose integrity does not bring them to lie is a view adopted by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Abū Yūsuf and a group of scholars and it has been report of al-Shafīʿī as well. As for the view which

¹ See also *Mīzān al-Iʿtidāl* 1/27

advocates a detailed division; then this is the view of the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth. Ibn Ḥibbān¹ has transmitted their consensus on this matter; since the innovator who is a caller to his way has an incentive to narrate that which supports his corrupted belief.

As for the narrator whose innovation results in departure from the religion; his narrations are to be rejected and al-Nawawī has reported the agreement on this. He said: “Whoever commits disbelief resulting from his innovation is not to be relied upon by consensus.”²

In *Ikhtisār ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (1/299), Ibn Kathīr states:

A heretic on account of innovation; there is no problem if his narrations are rejected.

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Nuzhah* (138):

The conclusion after examination and investigation is that not every innovators narration is to be rejected — even if it might be considered heresy on some level — since every group accuses the next of innovation and some exceed the bounds and declare statements of disbelief against its opponents. So the upheld view is that the narrations of those who reject what is known of the religion by necessity and transmitted by mass transmission, and believe contrary to it; their narrations will be disregarded.

Al-Mu‘allimī says in *al-Tankīl* (1/42):

There is no uncertainty in the fact that one whose innovation results in disbelief will not be accepted since it is a prerequisite for the acceptance of the narration of any narrator is Islam.

1 *Al-Thiqāt* 6/140, *Al-Majrūḥīn* 1/18

2 *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 1/383 and al-Nawawī's commentary on *Muslim* 1/60

The Third Alledged Defect

Numerous problems have been raised with the text of this narration which leads one to the conclusion that it is anomalous.

These problems and accusations against this narration are unfounded and what follows are some of the objections:

1. In some of the narrations of al-Bukhārī, Umm Ḥarām رضي الله عنها was married to ‘Ubādah ibn al-Šāmit the day the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم visited her, and in some versions ‘Ubadah رضي الله عنه only wed her later on.

The response: the narration which says that she was married to ‘Ubadah is from the type of narrations which refer to what had occurred later but expression given in the moment. This approach has been relied upon by al-Nawawī, upholding the stance of al-Qāḍī ‘Ayyād.¹

2. Some have found it problematic that the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم entered the home of a strange woman and rested his head on her lap.

The response: Umm Ḥarām was a relative of his through breastfeeding; some say she had a maternal relationship, some say she was his aunt by breastfeeding, and others say his sister. This is the view that has been presented with great confidence by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Ibn al-Jowzī, and Ibn Baṭṭāl. Ibn Ḥajar in *al-Fath* (11/81) is of the opinion that this was a unique feature for the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.²

3. This narration describes two naval expeditions; whereas the anomalous narration of ‘Umayr ibn al-Aswad describes one naval expedition and on land (the city of Caesar).

1 See *Fath al-Bārī* 11/75

2 For further reading refer to the book of Dr ‘Alī al-Šayyāh, *Ishkāl wa Jawābū fi Ḥadīth Umm Ḥarām bint Maḥḥān*

The response: The city of Caesar is Constantinople and part of it on land and part on sea as is in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (2920) from the narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. What further indicates this is the narration found in al-Ṭabarānī's *Mu'jam* (25/133) by way of Hishām ibn 'Ammār — from Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamzah — from Thowr ibn Yazīd — from Khālīd ibn Mi'dān — from 'Amr bin al-Aswad who narrated to him that he had come to 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit while he was at the coast of Ḥimṣ, in a home of his and with him was his wife, Umm Ḥarām bint Maḥḥān. 'Amr said: "She narrated to us that she heard the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم saying, 'the first army of my people to undertake a naval expedition on this sea have made Jannah incumbent upon them,' so Umm Ḥarām asked the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم if she was to be among them and he said, 'you are among them.' Thereafter the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said, 'the first army of my people to engage to the island of Caesar will be forgiven.' So Umm Ḥarām asked if she was among them as well and the Messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said, 'no.'" His statement the island of Caesar indicates what was previously mentioned.

4. The narration appears to indicate that the expedition of Umm Ḥarām رضي الله عنها was undertaken during the reign of Mu'āwiyah, whereas Umm Ḥarām passed away before that. Likewise, her husband 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه passed away before the reign of Mu'āwiyah..

The response: this occurred in the period of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه; and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the governor of al-Shām during that time; the year 28 A.H. The incident relates to the first naval expedition; and the first naval expedition occurred in the period of rule of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (11/78):

The general context of this report might lead one to assume that it occurred during his [Mu'āwiyah's] khilāfah, but it is not so. Some people have been deluded into taking it on its apparent value and fell into error. Indeed the incident refers only in relation to the first army that undertook a naval expedition.

5. It appears in some of the narrations that she was thrown off her mount in the city of Caesar; whereas other narrations indicate that this occurred on the coast of Ḥimṣ, in al-Shām.

The response: This incident refers to both Umm Ḥarām and her sister — if the narration is sound that she was buried on the coast of al-Shām — on account of it being two separate cases.

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (11/81):

So based on this, the story mentioned relates to different cases of a similar incident that happened to both Umm Ḥarām and her sister, Umm ‘Abd Allāh. So, perhaps one of them is buried on the coast of Cyprus and the other on the coasts of Ḥimṣ.

In *Aṭrāf al-Musnad* (9/494) he states:

... and this incident is identical to the incident of Umm Ḥarām. However, it is not her [Umm Ḥarām] but someone else besides her undoubtedly.

6. The leader of the naval expedition was Mundhir ibn Zubayr and not Mu‘āwiyah.

This relies on what has been narrated by ‘Abd al-Razzāq in his *Muṣannaf* (5/285), and via him in the *Musnad* of Aḥmad (27494)— from Ma‘mar — from Zayd ibn Aslam — from ‘Aṭā’ ibn Yasār that a woman narrated to him saying:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ slept and awoke laughing. So I said, “do you laugh at me, O Messenger of Allah ﷺ?” To which he replied, “no, however, due to a group from my people who are embarking on a naval expedition. Their likeness is similar to that of kings seated on thrones.” Then he slept again and awoke saying a similar statement including the following expression, “they shall return, their booty being little but their sins being forgiven.” So she said, “ask Allah to make me from among them,” and he prayed to Allah [for that].” ‘Aṭā’ said: “I had seen her in an expedition

which Mundhir ibn Zubayr undertook to the lands of the Romans and she passed away there.”

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (11/76): “This chain is on the criteria of the *ṣaḥīḥ* collection.” In *Aṭrāf al-Musnad* (9/489) he said: “This chain is authentic.”

In the narration of ‘Abd al-Razzāq (5/285) it appears: “The wife of Ḥudhayfah.” The correct version is ‘a woman narrated to him,’ as it is narrated in *Musnad Aḥmad* (27494) and *Aṭrāf al-Musnad* (9/489); since it has been narrated by way of ‘Abd al-Razzāq. The woman mentioned in this narration is al-Rumaysā’, Umm ‘Abd Allāh, the sister of Umm Sulaym and not Umm Ḥarām.

What follows further proves this:

- a. Abū Dāwūd (2492) narrates by way of the same chain — from Ma‘mar — from Zayd ibn Aslam — from ‘Aṭā’ ibn Yasār — from the sister of Umm Sulaym, al-Rumaysā’, she said: “The Prophet (saw) slept, then awoke,” — she was washing her hair — he awoke laughing and she said, “O Messenger of Allah (saw) do you laugh at my hair?” he replied, “no.” And he related the entire narration with minor additions and exclusions; and this narration is on the criteria of al-Bukhārī.
- b. ‘Aṭā’ ibn Yasār did not meet Umm Ḥarām. The narrations above indicate that the woman narrated to him directly. He was too young to have met Umm Ḥarām and to have engaged in military expeditions in 28 A.H; not even in 33 A.H since he was only born in 18 A.H. That is why Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (11/79):

What seems apparent to me is that the statement of those who claim that the narration of ‘Aṭā’ is from Umm Ḥarām is clearly an oversight. Instead it is al-Rumaysā’ and not Umm Sulaym even though she is also referred to as al-Rumaysā’ as well.

- c. The incident which refers to Mundhir ibn Zubayr being the leader of the

army differs somewhat from the narration of Umm Ḥarām in certain aspects. Firstly, in the narration of Umm Ḥaram she was combing his hair, and in the other narration she was washing her own hair as in the narration of Abū Dāwūd (2492). Secondly, the apparent expression of the narration of Umm Ḥarām is that the second expedition will be on land; whereas the other narration refers to fighting from sea. Thirdly, in the narration of Umm Ḥarām it mentions that she will be part of the first expedition; whereas in the other narration she is from the second expedition.

- d. In the narration of Umm Ḥarām the leader of the army is Mu'āwiyah, and in the other narration the leader of the army is Mundhir ibn Zubayr. Ibn Hajar states in *al-Fath* (11/79):

So based on this, the story mentioned relates to different cases of a similar incident that happened to both Umm Ḥarām and her sister Umm 'Abd Allāh. So, perhaps one of them is buried on the coast of Cyprus and the other on the coast of Ḥimṣ."

In *Aṭrāf al-Musnad* (9/494) he states:

... and this incident is identical to the incident of Umm Ḥarām. However, it is not her [Umm Ḥarām] but someone else besides her undoubtedly.

- e. Mundhir ibn Zubayr was still young during the khilāfah of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The likes of him would not ordinarily participate in battle; let alone lead the army. Mundhir was born in the khilāfah of 'Umar رضي الله عنه and the first naval expedition occurred in 28 A.H.
7. General expression does not encompass every individual; so it follows that this Ḥadīth does not refer to Mu'āwiyah on account of the defamatory narrations regarding him.

The response to this is that general expression does encompass every individual except those excluded on the basis of specific evidence. There is specific evidence

proving the virtue of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه like the ḥadīth, “O Allah guide him, and guide [others] through him.” The authentication of this narration has been previously mentioned; as well as a rebuttal of the futile attempts to discredit it. Likewise, it has previously been proven that the narrations in condemnation of him are false and unreliable.

8. Who killed Umm Ḥarām? It has been said that the greater probability for Mu'āwiyah's assassination of Umm Ḥarām are two speculative – not absolute – matters. The first consideration is the expression in the narration, “a mule was brought for her to mount;” whom do you expect presented her with a demented mule? One that will throw an unknown rider off and cause their neck to snap? The second consideration is that the description of the mule in the authentic narrations is that it is *Shahbā'* [grey in colour, where the whiteness predominates]; and thus is the description of the mules of Mu'āwiyah.

The response to the first alleged proof is two-fold:

1. This is based purely on speculation; and speculation is the most untruthful of speech. Further this just displays a negative impression of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.
2. As for his statement, “a mule was brought for her to mount; whom do you expect presented her with a demented mule? One that will throw an unknown rider off and cause their neck to snap,” the reality is that the mule belonged to Umm Ḥarām رضي الله عنها and not Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. The narration in al-Bukhārī clearly states this; see *Fath al-Bārī* (11/78):

She was thrown off her mount when she returned from sea; and thus passed away.

As for the second alleged proof; the narration appears in *Musnad Aḥmad* (27077):

A mule of hers threw her off resulting in her neck snapping...

As for his statement, “the description of the mule in the authentic narrations is that it is *Shahbā’* [grey in colour, where the whiteness predominates]; and thus is the description of the mules of Mu’āwiyah,” then it appears in the narration of Ḥammād ibn Salamah in *Aḥmad* (27077):

A mule of her’s, whitish-grey in colour, threw her off resulting in her neck snapping and she died as a result thereof.

In the narration of al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (233) it appears with the wording:

It kicked her.

The Third Narration

Indeed this son of mine is a Sayyid and I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation, through him, between two great groups of the Muslims.

This narration has many points of benefit:

1. Praise for Ḥasan رضي الله عنه.
2. Both parties are upon Islam.
3. Praise for the abdication of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه in favour of Mu’āwiyah رضي الله عنه.
4. The statement regarding the hypocrisy or disbelief of Mu’āwiyah رضي الله عنه — how far he is from being described as such — necessitates disrepute of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه since it is inconceivable that he would entrust the leadership of the ummah to a man who is a hypocrite and condemned by the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in *Majmū’ al-Fatāwā* (4/466), said:

This which Ḥasan رضي الله عنه has done is that which has been praised by the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم as is established in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and others, from the

narration of Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه that the Prophet ﷺ said: “This son of mine is a sayyid and I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation, through him, between two great groups of the Muslims.” So the Prophet ﷺ made that which he praised his grandson with, the fact that Allah reconciled at his hands between the two major factions among the Muslims. That occurred when he handed over the khilāfah to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; whilst — prior to that — each party had approached the other with huge armies. Since the Prophet ﷺ praised the reconciliation and abandoning the fighting; it indicated that the reconciliation between both parties was more beloved to Allah than their fighting. Hence, it indicates that the fighting between these two parties was not that with which Allah commanded. Furthermore, if Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was a disbeliever, then nominating him and abdicating in favour of him would not have been pleasing to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ. Instead, this narration proves that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his party were believers; and that which had been done by Ḥasan رضي الله عنه was praiseworthy in the sight of Allah, pleasing to Him and His Messenger ﷺ. Likewise it has been established from the Prophet ﷺ in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, from the narration of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه, that the Prophet ﷺ said: “A faction will renegade at a time when there is division among the Muslims; and the party, among two parties, which is closer to the truth, will fight them.” Therefore, this authentic narration is a proof that both fighting parties — ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his party as well as Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his party — were upon the truth; and that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his party were the closest to the truth than Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his party.

He states further in *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* (4/529):

... and this clearly indicates that the reconciliation between both parties was beloved to Allah and His Messenger ﷺ and was considered praiseworthy. Further, it indicates that which Ḥasan رضي الله عنه did (i.e. reconciling), is from his greatest virtues and merits which bore praise from the Messenger ﷺ. Were fighting obligatory, or even recommended, the Prophet ﷺ would not have praised anyone for abandoning an obligation or omitting a recommended practise.

Ibn Kathīr said in *Ikhtisār ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (2/499):

The fulfilment of that came to the fore when Ḥasan abdicated in favour of Mu‘āwiyah after the demise of his father, ‘Alī. So the community was united behind Mu‘āwiyah and that year was called the year of unity; and that was in the year 40 A.H. The Prophet ﷺ called both parties “Muslims”; and (Allah) said: “If two parties from the believers fight each other; then bring about reconciliation between them...”¹ describing both parties as believers despite the internal fighting.

The First Alleged Defect

The principle according to the scholars of ḥadīth is that Ḥasan (al-Baṣrī) did not hear from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه... and the explicit mention of hearing the narration is an error on the part of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah.

There are a number of responses to this allegation:

1. Ḥasan al-Baṣrī indeed heard this narration from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه hence al-Bukhārī and ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī have established the fact that he heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه, as it is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (2557, 6692).
2. This narration has been narrated by a group of reliable, well established narrators by way of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan — having heard it — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه. It is farfetched to think that all of them have erred in their hearing of this narration from Sufyān that he relates it from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan — having clearly stated that he heard it — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه. It is also farfetched to imagine that all of these reliable and trustworthy narrators all narrate this from Sufyān after his memory lapsed; even though his lapse is minimal and is of no major consequence as will be explained later — with Allah’s permission — in mention of their narrations and tracing the variant chains.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9

The Second Alleged Defect

Al-Dāraqūṭnī, in *al-Ilzāmāt*, considers weak the narrations of Ḥasan — having heard — from Abū Bakrah, and included in that is this narration, “indeed this son of mine is a sayyid...” Al-Dāraqūṭnī says: “Ḥasan only narrates it by way of al-Aḥnaf — from Abū Bakrah.” I consider the view of al-Dāraqūṭnī to be clear in rendering weak in general all the narrations of Ḥasan where he narrates directly from Abū Bakrah (having heard from him).

This will be rebutted with the following points:

1. The ḥadīth is narrated from Ḥasan by various chains; whilst al-Bukhārī only adopted the narration of Abū Mūsā, from Ḥasan that he heard Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه. He has included the narration with its complete wording in the chapter of settlement and commented at the end of it that ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh said: “It is through this narration that we have established that Ḥasan (al-Baṣrī) heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.”¹
2. Ibn Ḥajar states in *Hadī al-Sārī* (386):

I continue to be amazed at assertiveness in his view that Ḥasan al-Baṣrī did not hear from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه despite the narration appearing in al-Bukhārī... As for al-Dāraqūṭnī’s argument that al-Bukhārī narrates this particular ḥadīth with an alternative chain — from Ḥasan — from al-Aḥnaf — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه then there is no contradiction since in the narration that goes via al-Aḥnaf there is a clear addition which is not found in the ḥadīth which he narrates directly from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.

The Third Alleged Defect

The opinion of rejecting the narration of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah, from Abū Mūsā, from Ḥasan — having heard — from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه due to numerous considerations:

1 Al-Bukhārī (2/962), *Kitāb al-Ṣulḥ*, Bāb al-Ṣulḥ fī al-Diyah, Ḥadīth: 2557

His contradiction of the other reliable narrators, who all narrate it with a Mursal chain:-

- a. Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād narrates in *al-Fitan* (417) from Hushaym ibn Bashīr — from Yūnus — from ‘Ubayd — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain (pg. 105).
- b. Al-Nasā’ī narrates in *‘Amal al-Yawm wa l-Laylah* (256) by way of Hishām ibn Ḥassān — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain.
- c. Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah narrates in his *Musnad* (1899) by way of Sahl ibn Abī al-Ṣalt — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain.
- d. Ibn Abī Shaybah narrates in his *Muṣannaf* (32178) and (37362), from Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Ju‘fī — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain.
- e. Al-Nasā’ī narrates in *‘Amal al-Yawm wa l-Laylah* (254) by way of ‘Awf — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain.
- f. Al-Nasā’ī narrates in *‘Amal al-Yawm wa l-Laylah* (255) by way of Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain.

In response to this I say: the narration of Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād narrated in *al-Fitan* (417) from Hushaym ibn Bashīr — from Yūnus — from ‘Ubayd — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain is problematic on account of Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād al-Khuzā‘ī. He was firm on the Sunnah but weak in narration. Al-Nasā’ī¹ considers him weak as well as Ibn Ma‘īn².

Hushaym ibn Bashīr narrates with ‘an‘anah and does not expressly state that he heard. Furthermore, in al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Mu‘jam al-Ṣaḡhīr* (766) and *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* (2592) this narration appears by way of Hushaym — from Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd and Maṣṣūr — from Zādhān — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, with a Marfū‘ chain.

1 *Al-Ḍu‘afā wa al-Matrūkīn* (244)

2 *Su‘ālāt al-Ājurrī* of Abū Dāwūd (1/284)

The narration of Al-Nasā'ī in *'Amal al-Yowm wa l-Laylah* (256) by way of Hishām ibn Ḥassān — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain is problematic since Hishām ibn Ḥassān, even though he is reliable in general, is weak in what he narrates from Ḥasan. Ismā'īl ibn 'Ulayyah said: “We did not consider the narration of Hishām ibn Ḥassan from Ḥasan worth anything.”¹

As for the narration Ishāq ibn Rāhūyah in his *Musnad* (1899) by way of Sahl ibn Abī al-Ṣalt — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain; this chain is narrated via Sahl ibn Abī al-Ṣalt who was overall honest, but he had solitary narrations. Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd al-Qaṭṭān was not pleased with him.

As for the narrations of Ibn Abī Shaybah in his *Muṣannaf* (32178, 37362) — from Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Ju'fī — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain, and al-Nasā'ī in *'Amal al-Yowm wa l-Laylah* (254) by way of 'Awf — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain, and *'Amal al-Yowm wa l-Laylah* (255) by way of Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind — from Ḥasan with a Mursal chain; these Mursal narrations are contradicted by tens of uninterrupted chains; some of which are with 'an'anah, and some with explicit mention of Ḥasan having heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه. For the sake of brevity I will limit myself to five uninterrupted narrations, three of which have 'an'anah, and some have explicit mention of Ḥasan having heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.

1. The uninterrupted chain with 'an'anah by way of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Ju'fī; al-Bukhārī (3430) narrates from 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Musnadī — from Yaḥyā ibn Ādam — from Ḥusayn al-Ju'fī — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah — without express mention of hearing it from Abū Bakrah.²

1 *Al-Tahdhīb* (4/268)

2 See what al-Mālikī has written in *al-Ṣuḥbah wa al-Ṣaḥābah* (pg. 231), he has rejected this narration with the most strange, unprecedented excuses, based purely on speculation and conjecture. He rejects it due to an oversight on the side of al-Bukhārī, or the teacher of al-Bukhārī 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Musnadī, or the intentional forgery of Yaḥyā ibn Ādam — who is reliable and a narrator in all six collections — on account of him being of the line of Khālid ibn 'Uqbah ibn Abī Mu't. Is this how narrations are to be criticised? All that one needs to do in rejecting a narration in al-Bukhārī is to say that he erred?

2. The uninterrupted chain with ‘an‘anah from Ash‘ath ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ḥumrānī — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah; a group of scholars narrate this: Abū Dāwūd (4662), al-Tirmidhī (3773), al-Nasā’ī in *‘Amal al-Yawm wa l-Laylah* (253)¹, al-Ḥākim (4863), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (3/34) as well as Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (13/235). Al-Tirmidhī said: “This ḥadīth is Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ.”
3. The uninterrupted chain with ‘an‘anah from al-Mubarak ibn Faḍālah — from Ḥasan — from Abū Bakrah, this has been narrated by Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī in his *Musnad* (874) and al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Kabīr* (2591).
4. The uninterrupted chain with *Samā’* between Ḥasan and Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه; al-Bukhārī narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2557) by way of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah — from Abū Mūsā — who said — I heard Ḥasan saying I heard Abū Bakrah. It is narrated from Sufyān by both ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī (2557) and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Musnadī (4072).²
5. The uninterrupted chain with *Samā’* between Ḥasan and Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه, it is narrated as such by Ibn Ḥibbān in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (6964), Abū Nu‘aym in *al-Hilyah* (2/35), al-Bazzār (3656), Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (13/237), by way of Abū al-Walīd al-Ṭayālīsī — who said — Mubārah ibn Faḍālah narrated to us from Ḥasan — who said — Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه narrated to me. Likewise it is narrated by Aḥmad in his *Musnad* (20466) by way of Hāshim ibn al-Qāsim — who said — Mubārah ibn Faḍālah narrated to us — who said — Ḥasan narrated to us³ — who said Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه narrated to us; and the narration in the *Musnad* (20535) by way of ‘Affān — who said — Mubārah ibn Faḍālah narrated to us, from Ḥasan — who said — Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه narrated to me.

1 There is also a narration from Anas (pg.259).

2 And a group of narrators as will follow in the next few pages.

3 Al-Mālikī did not indicate the *Samā’* between Mubārah ibn Faḍālah and Ḥasan; and between Ḥasan and Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه.

As for the response regarding the allegation that Sufyān contradicts the other reliable narrators, who all narrate it with ‘an‘anah, I say: Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah is reliable and an Imām (of ḥadīth). It is farfetched to think that he blundered in this narration since the great, reliable scholars of ḥadīth narrate it from him, upholding the *Samā‘* between Ḥasan and Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه; their mention will follow later in this treatise.

As for the allegation that his memory lapsed and he would get confused in the chains; the lapse that occurred to Ibn ‘Uyaynah is of no major consequence since *Ikhṭilāt* (confusion) is divided into two categories:

- a. Such confusion that has an effect on the narrations of a narrator that his narrations are not accepted
- b. Minimal confusion which have no consequence on the status of the narrator or his narrations

Similar to this is the transition in the memory of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah, since none have pointed this out besides Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, al-Bukhārī and Muslim rely on his early and later narrations; although his earlier narrations are considered stronger than his later narrations; therefore he says to hold on to the older narrations.¹

Al-Dhahabī states in *al-Siyar* (10/84):

Every change that occurs in the terminal illness is not a basis for discredit in a reliable narrator since most people are subject to lapse in memory when enduring such a harsh illness. However, what is dangerous is that when a reliable narrator experiences such memory lapse and confusion that he does not narrate during that state such that it brings about discrepancies in the chain or text and there will be contradictions on account of that.²

1 *Al-Tahdhīb* (2/60), *al-Siyar* (8/465) and *al-Mīzān* (2/171)

2 For further reading on the subject of altered states of recollection one may refer to *Sharḥ al-‘ilal* (2/563) Ḥuṣayn ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, the biography of Hishām ibn ‘Urwah in *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* (4/301) and the biography of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī in *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* (2/270).

Assuming the altered memory of Sufyān, the teachers of the compilers of the six major collections all heard from him before this transition. Al-Dhahabī says in *al-Mīzān* (2/171):

What seems most accurate in my judgment is that all the teachers of the six Imāms have heard from him before the year 197 , i.e. before his transition in the year 197 AH.

As for the allegation that he became confused in this narration and the fact that he narrates it with ‘*an‘anah* and *Samā*’ is an indication that he was confused. The response to this allegation is that — as previously established — Sufyān’s transition was one of no consequence. Secondly, those who narrate it from Sufyān — from Abū Mūsā — from Ḥasan with an uninterrupted chain explicitly mentioning that he heard from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه are greater in number and more knowledgeable about the intricacies of the science of ḥadīth than those who narrate it with ‘*an‘anah*, and their narrations are preferred. The one who proves is given preference over the one who denies; and they are as follows:

- a. ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī as in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (7109), and *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (387).
- b. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī as in *Musnad Aḥmad* (793), and *al-Sunan al-Kubra* of al-Bayhaqī (16486).
- c. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal as in his *Musnad* (20408).
- d. Sa‘īd ibn Manṣūr as in *al-Sunan al-Kubra* of al-Bayhaqī (16486).
- e. Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbād as in *al-Sunan al-Kubra* of al-Bayhaqī (11705).
- f. Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr as in *al-Ṣughrā* of al-Nasā‘ī (1410) and in ‘*Amal al-Yowm wa l-Laylah*’ (252), and Ibn Ḥazm in *al-Muḥallā* (4/227).
- g. Ibrāhīm ibn Bashshār al-Ramādī as in *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* (3/33), and in al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Kabīr* (2590).

- h. Al-Ṣalt ibn Mas'ūd as in *Mustakhraj al-Ismā'īlī*, Ibn Ḥajar notes this in *al-Fath* (13/66).

From this we can see the futility in the claim that Ḥasan did not hear from Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه in the uninterrupted chains.

The Fourth Alledged Defect

The possibility of *Idraj* (addition to the text) in this narration.¹

The response to this is as follows:

1. None of the scholars of ḥadīth whether from the early scholars or later scholars have said that this wording has been added to the text.
2. The narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه which is limited to the statement, “indeed he is a sayyid” is unreliable. Al-Nasā'ī narrates it in *ʿAmal al-Yowm wa l-Laylah* (250) — by way of Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Madanī — from Muslim ibn Abī Maryam — from Sa'īd al-Maqburī — Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه.

Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Madanī has been included by Ibn Ḥibbān in *al-Thiqāt* (7/385), and in *al-Ḍu'afā'*. He said: “He narrates objectionable narrations.”² Abū Ḥātim said: “He is a teacher.”³ Ibn Ḥajar says of him in *al-Taqrīb* (5964): “Acceptable.”

Assuming the reliability of this narration (i.e. narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه),

1 See *al-Ṣuḥbah wa al-Ṣaḥābah* (241) he states: “Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه narrates it only with the wording, “indeed he is a sayyid,” likewise it is narrated as such by Abū Juḥayfah. So based on this the most dominant view — and Allah knows best — is that the addition, “I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation at his hands between two major groups among the Muslims,” is an addition by Abū Bakrah that has been injected into the text; and this is a flaw that I have not found anyone pointing it out.

2 *Al-Majrūhīn* (2/260), he said: “It is not permissible to rely on his narrations if he is not corroborated.”

3 *Al-Jarḥ wal-Ta'dīl* (7/287)

it does not necessarily mean that in the narration of Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه the words, “I anticipate that Allah will bring about reconciliation at his hands to two major groups among the Muslims,” is an addition that has been injected into the text.

Chapter Three

Dealing with the Fabrications that Have been Invented about Mu'āwiyah

From the outset, I would like to point out that the fabrications that I will address regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه have been circulated by historians. Some historians, without any discretion or scruples have burdened themselves with the spread of these narrations and reports which have no historical value. In addition to this, some of these historians have agendas since they are considered Rāfiḍah, or other brands of people of innovation, or even just narrators whose narrations deserve to be abandoned (by the standards of the scholars of ḥadīth). Some fine specimens of these propagandists are:

- » Abū Mikhnaf, Lūṭ ibn Yaḥya, a historian, corrupted, not to be relied upon¹. He was abandoned by Abū Ḥatim and Ibn Maʿīn², and al-Ḍāraqūṭnī declared him weak.³
- » Naṣr ibn Muzāḥhim, the author of the book *al-Ṣifḥīn*. The opinions of the scholars of ḥadīth regarding him have previously been quoted and it was established that he is *Matrūk* (abandoned).
- » Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī, the exegete and historian, he is *Matrūk* (abandoned) in ḥadīth as well.⁴
- » Al-Balādhurī, who is Aḥmad ibn Yaḥya ibn Jābir ibn Dāwūd (d. 279 A.H), author of the book *Ansāb al-Ashraf* — He is acceptable as a narrator. However, scholars have identified many of his stories as peculiar and unverified, especially in

1 *Al-Kāmil* by Ibn 'Adī (6/93), *al-Ḍu'afā'* by al-'Uqaylī (4/190), *Lisān al-Mizān* by Ibn Ḥajar (2/430)

2 *Al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (7/182)

3 *Al-Ḍu'afā'* by al-Dāraqūṭnī (33)

4 *Al-Tahdhīb* (3/569), *al-Mizān* (3/556)

criticism of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه — whom he has written on extensively in terms of his biographical details — and they have objected to these narrations and reports; which he acknowledged himself. He writes in his book *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*:

Hishām ibn ‘Ammār said to me: “I have perused your narrations regarding Mu‘āwiyah and found most of them to be inventions.”

despite this he includes these in his book?!

- » Hishām ibn ‘Ammār (d. 245 A.H) and is a teacher al-Bukhārī as well as al-Balādhurī.

The First Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Traded in Alcohol

In response to this allegation I say: al-Shāshī narrated in his *Musnad* (1196) and Ibn ‘Asakir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (26/198), by way of Yahya ibn Sulaym — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Khuthaym — from Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Rifā‘ah — from his father:

‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit used to see containers, during his residence in al-Shām, passing by him and he enquired if they contained oil. It was said to him, “Alcohol, it is being sold for so-and-so.” So he took a blade from the marketplace and punctured every leather skin containing the alcohol. Abū Hurayrah was present in al-Shām during that time; and so-and-so sent for him and said: “why do you not keep our brother, ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit, from us? As for the mornings he goes to the marketplace and spoils the business of the people of *Dhimma* (Jews and Christians under Muslim protection), and as for the evenings he sits in the Masjid and has no work except to abuse our integrity and find fault with us. So keep your brother away from

1 Op. cit. (5/81)

us!” So Abū Hurayrah went to ‘Ubādah and said to him, “O ‘Ubādah, what is it with you and Mu‘āwiyah? Leave him and whatever (burden) he carries for indeed Allah says:

That was a nation that has passed: for it there will be what it has earned, and for you there will be what you have earned.¹

He responded by saying: “O Abū Hurayrah, were you not with us when we pledged our allegiance to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? We pledged to listen and obey in times of activity and calm; and to spend in times of difficulty and ease; and to enjoin good and forbid evil; and not be discouraged in obeying of Allah regardless of whatever censure comes our way; and that we will assist him when he comes to Yathrib; and defend him from which we would defend our own lives and that of our wives and families; and for that we shall get Jannah. Whoever holds true to his pledge; Allah will hold true His promise of Jannah on account of upholding the pledge to the Messenger ﷺ. Whoever goes back on his pledge, then he has only harmed himself.” Abū Hurayrah did not respond with anything, so such-and-such a person wrote to ‘Uthmān in Madīnah that ‘Ubādah is causing disturbance in al-Shām and troubling its inhabitants. Either you stop ‘Ubādah from whatever he is doing; or you remove him from al-Shām. So, ‘Uthmān wrote to so-and-so instructing him to send ‘Ubādah back to his home in Madīnah. So-and-so then dispatched him to Madīnah and he entered the gathering of ‘Uthmān and there were present only a companion from the early companions and some of the Tābi‘īn. He sat towards the end of the house and ‘Uthmān turned to him and said, “what is between you and us, O ‘Ubādah?” So he stood up and replied, “I heard the Prophet ﷺ saying, “there will take charge of your affairs after me men who will introduce to you that which you disapprove, and they will disapprove of you that which you are acquainted with; hence there is no obedience to those who disobey Allah, and do not present excuses before your Rabb (for your disobedience in these matters).” ‘Ubādah said, “by Allah, so-and-so is from among them.” ‘Uthmān did not rebuke him by even an utterance.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 134

This narration is not authentic and has been dealt with earlier on and it was proven that it had defects and irreconcilable differences within the variant narrations of it.

The narration appears in *Musnad Aḥmad* (37/430) and is narrated by way of Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh — from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUthmān ibn Khuthaym — from Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUbayd ibn Rifāʿah — from ʿUbādah; he narrated it from ʿUbādah without mentioning his father.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Imām Aḥmad narrates it in the *Musnad* (37/450), and it is in *al-Awsaṭ* of al-Ṭabarānī (2894), (without mentioning the incident of trading in alcohol), as well as al-Shāshī in his *Musnad* (1196) by way of Yaḥyā ibn Sulaym — from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUthmān ibn Khuthaym — from Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUbayd ibn Rifāʿah — from his father — from ʿUbādah.

Al-Haythamī, in *al-Majmaʿ* (5/408), says:

Aḥmad narrates it in its entirety but he did not say — from Ismāʿīl — from his father. When ʿAbd Allāh narrates it he adds — from his father —, and it is like that in al-Ṭabarānī, and its narrators are reliable.

In it is the *Jahālah* (unknown status) of Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUbayd. Some say ibn ʿUbayd Allāh ibn Rifāʿah al-Zuraqī.

Al-Dhahabī has said:

I do not know of anyone narrating from him besides from ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUthmān ibn Khuthaym.¹

In his *Taqrīb* Ibn Ḥajar has said:

Acceptable, i.e. if he is corroborated, otherwise he is lenient. However, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿUbayd has not been corroborated.

¹ *Al-Mīzān* (1/283)

As for the text of the ḥadīth; and supposing the authenticity of the narration, it does not prove that Mu‘āwiyah traded in alcohol. All that it amounts to was that he allowed the people of dhimmah to trade as such; and it was not his own transaction since the narration clearly states his comment, “as for the mornings he goes to the marketplace and spoils the business of the people of *dhimmah* (Jews and Christians under Muslim protection).”

Furthermore, were it correct then it would indict ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه as well that he did not deal with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه after the complaint of trading in alcohol having reached him. Instead he allowed him to govern the province of al-Shām; and called ‘Ubadah رضي الله عنه to question him for reprimanding Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Similar to this is what has been quoted by Ibn ‘Arrāq al-Kinānī in *Tanzīh al-Sharī‘ah* (2/9) — the report from Ibn ‘Ā’ishah — from his father that Yazīd during his young days was an open consumer of alcohol. Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه realised this and wanted to admonish him for doing it openly and suggested that it be done at night discreetly so he composed some couplets of poetry wherein he made these suggestions. At the end of it Ibn ‘Arrāq said:

... and this, in addition to its interrupted chain, is a fabrication which is the handiwork of al-Ghulābī. As for the couplets, they are actually the words of Yahyā ibn Khālīd al-Barmakī who had written them for his son, ‘Abd Allāh, who was madly in love with a singing girl.

The Second Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Traded in Usury

In response to this allegation I say, Muslim has narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (4047) by way of Ayyūb — from Abū Qilābah who said:

I was in Syria (among) a circle (of friends), in which was Muslim ibn Yasār. There came Abū al-Ash’ath. He (the narrator) said that they (the friends) called him, Abū al-Ash’ath, and he sat down. I said to him, Narrate to our

brother the ḥadīth of ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit. He said, “yes, we went out on an expedition, Mu‘āwiyah was the leader of the people, and we gained a lot of spoils of war. And there was one silver utensil in what we took as spoils. Mu‘āwiyah ordered a person to sell it for payment to the people (soldiers). The people made haste in getting that. The news of (this state of affairs) reached ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit, and he stood up and said, I heard Allah’s Messenger ﷺ forbidding the sale of gold by gold, and silver by silver, and wheat by wheat, and barley by barley, and dates by dates, and salt by salt, except like for like, and equal for equal. So he who made an addition, or who accepted an addition, committed the sin of taking interest. So the people returned what they had got. This reached Mu‘āwiyah; and he stood up to deliver an address. He said: “What is the matter with people that they narrate from the Messenger ﷺ such traditions which we did not hear though we saw him (the Prophet) and lived in his company?” Thereupon, ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit stood up and repeated that narration, and then said, “we will definitely narrate what we heard from Allah’s Messenger ﷺ though it may be unpleasant to Mu‘āwiyah (or he said: Even if it is against his will). I do not mind if I do not accompany him in his troops during dark night.”

This is responded to by the following:

1. Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was not the only one to hold this stray view that there is no Ribā except *Nasī’ah* (deferred transfer). The view of permissibility of Ribā al-Faḍl was also attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn ‘Umar, al-Barā ibn ‘Āzib and Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه. Why single out Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه?

Muslim reports (4062), by way of Abū Naḍraḥ, who narrates:

I asked Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه about the conversion (of gold and silver for silver and gold). He asked, “is it hand to hand exchange?” I replied, “yes.” Whereupon he said, “there is no harm in it.” I informed Abū Sa‘īd رضي الله عنه about it, telling him that I had asked Ibn ‘Abbās about it and that he [Ibn ‘Abbās] said, “is it hand to hand exchange? I said, ‘yes,’ whereupon he [Ibn ‘Abbās] said,

“there is no harm in it.” He [Abū Saʿīd] then said: “We will soon write to him, and he will not give you this *fatwā* (religious verdict).”

The same view has been narrated of Ibn ʿUmar, as related by Muslim in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (4063) by way of Abū Naḍraḥ, who reported:

I asked Ibn ʿUmar and Ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه about the conversion of gold with gold but they did not find any harm in that. I was sitting in the company of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه and asked him about this exchange, and he said, “whatever is in excess is interest.”

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (4/482):

Sarf: a transaction of exchange of gold for silver and silver for gold, has two prerequisites:

- i. Absence of *Nasīʾah* (deferred exchange) with a similar type or variant type, and upon this there is consensus.
- ii. Absence of *tafāḍul* (excess) if it is of the same type and this is the view of the majority.

Ibn ʿUmar differed with this and then retracted his original view, the same has been said of Ibn ʿAbbās but there is a difference of opinion regarding his retraction...

Al-Nawāwī, in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (11/26), states:

Thereafter, Ibn ʿUmar and Ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه retracted from that and considered prohibited the sale of like items in excess, once the narration of Abū Saʿīd رضي الله عنه reached them as mentioned by *Muslim*.

2. Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه and those besides him held their view based on their taʾwīl that ribā was only prohibited as in the deferred form.

Ibn Taymiyyah states in his *Fatāwā* (32/238):

It is well known that those that permitted *Nabīdh* (fermented dates) which is disputed are from the generation of the earliest Muslim; and those who permitted the exchange of one silver coin for two are from the earliest Muslims are more and greater in virtue than those before. So, Ibn ‘Abbās, Mu‘āwiyah and others besides them have permitted the exchange of one silver coin for two and their excuse was the interpretation of *ribā* was that it was only prohibited on deferral, not on an immediate exchange.

3. It can be said regarding those Ṣaḥābah who permitted *Ribā al-Faḍl* that the narration of prohibition did not reach them.

The narration appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (4037) that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said when he heard the narration of ‘Ubādah رضي الله عنه:

What is the matter with people that they narrate from the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم such traditions which we did not hear though we saw him and lived in his company?

Al-Nawāwī said in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (11/26):

These narrations mentioned by Muslim indicate that the prohibition did not reach Ibn ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه, and once it reached them they retracted their stance on it.

I say: Likewise is the case with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

The Third Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Sold Idols to the People of India

This fantasy tale has been narrated by al-Balādhurī in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (5/137) by way of Jarīr — from al-A‘mash — from Abū Wā’il who said:

I was with Masrūq at al-Silsilah when ships laden with idols and statues of men passed by so he asked them about it and they responded, “Mu‘āwiyah

is exporting these to the lands of *al-Sindh* [Sindh] and *al-Hind* [India] to be sold for him.” So Masrūq remarked, “if I knew they would kill me I would have sunk these (ships). However, I fear they will torture me and put me to test. By Allah, I do not know what kind of man Mu‘āwiyah is; is he a man who has no hope in the next life that he indulges in worldly vanity, or is he a man whose evil has appeared as adorned to him.”

Ibn Abī Shaybah (5/267) narrates it by way of Abū Mu‘āwiyah — from al-A‘mash — from Abū Wā’il without mentioning Mu‘āwiyah. Likewise al-Ṭabarī narrates it in *Tahdhīb al-Āthār* (4/399) by way of Sufyān — from al-A‘mash — from Abū Wā’il.

The falsehood in this report is very clear. Does it not contradict the reliable ḥadīth wherein the Prophet ﷺ prayed for him that Allah guide him and make him a guide for others? How is it possible that Allah guides him and he sells idols?

Therefore, the senior critics have severely criticised this fabrication. Al-A‘mash did not expressly narrate it with *Samā’* which is a cause to believe that there is *Tadlīs* (omission of a narrator in the chain) on account of the obscurity of the narration.

Al-Mu‘allimī states in *al-Tankīl* (1/51):

Likewise, in the narrations of al-A‘mash there are narrations which the scholars have declared weak. Some of them consider the weakness to come about on account of those above al-A‘mash in the chain, some of them on account of interruptions, and some on account of al-A‘mash not expressly narrating it with *Samā’* which results in *Tadlīs*. From the last kind there is a narration regarding Mu‘āwiyah which al-Bukhārī mentions in *al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr* (pg.68)¹ and declared it weak on account of the *Tadlīs* of al-A‘mash.

He also says in the introduction of *al-Fawā’id al-Majmū‘ah* (8):

1 See also *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* (71)

If the great scholars find the text condemnable and the chain appears to be sound, then they usually look for an ‘illah (subtle defect). If they cannot find an ‘illah in a general sense, but they consider it sufficient for reproach of that condemnable narration is when they indicate a flaw in the narration on the basis of the narrator not having heard it from the one whom he has transmitted from; despite the narrator not being one who does *Tadlīs* (as a habit). Al-Bukhārī found fault of the same kind in a narration transmitted ‘Amr ibn Abī ‘Amr Mawlā al-Muṭṭalib — from ‘Ikrimah — under the biography of ‘Amr in *Tahdhīb*.¹

In *al-Muntakhab min al-‘Ilal* (227) by al-Khallāl it appears:

Muḥannā said: “I asked Aḥmad about the narration of al-A‘mash — from Abū Wā’il that Mu‘āwiyah dabbled with idols. He responded, ‘how harsh are the people of Kūfah with the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the narration is not sound. A man from the Shī‘ah spoke of this.”

This is what Imām Aḥmad said about someone who accused Mu‘āwiyah of involvement with idols, what about selling them?

The Fourth Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Took False Oaths, and the Messenger ﷺ Exposed his Lies

Al-Rūyānī narrates in his *Musnad* (1/290) and Ibn ‘Asākir in his *Tārīkh* (59/204) by way of Salamah ibn al-Faḍl — from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq — from ‘Āsim ibn ‘Umar ibn Qatādah — from Muḥammad ibn Ka‘b who said:

We were seated with al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib in the Maṣjid of al-Kūfah when a preacher entered, then sat, then began an address, after which he prayed for the general masses, the exclusive class, and then for the khalīfah — Mu‘āwiyah was the khalīfah at the time — so we said to al-Barā’: “O Abū Ibrāhīm, this man entered and prayed for the exclusives, the general masses and then the khalīfah. However, we have not heard you saying anything?”

¹ *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (8/72)

So he said, “verily we were present and you were absent, we had knowledge and you were ignorant; once we were with the Prophet ﷺ at Ḥunayn when a woman came until she stood right before the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and said, ‘indeed Abū Sufyān and his son, Mu‘āwiyah, have taken a camel of mine and hidden it away from me.’ The Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent a man to Abū Sufyān and Mu‘āwiyah instructing them to return this woman’s camel, and they responded — swearing by Allah — that they did not take it nor do they know where it is. The man was sent to them and they responded in the same manner. Thereafter the Messenger ﷺ became angry until we could see it in his face saying, ‘go to them and tell them, Certainly, By Allah it is with you! Return the camel to this woman!’ Then the Prophet ﷺ went to them and they had made the camel to sit and tied it. Startled, they said, ‘by Allah we did not take it. Rather we went in search of it until we found it,’ so the Prophet ﷺ said, ‘Go!’”

This is unreliable on the basis of the chain and the content.

In the chain is Salamah ibn al-Faḍl al-Abrash who is weak in ḥadīth. He has many strange and obscure narrations — previous mention has been made of him. Whatever he narrates from Muḥammad ibn Ishāq in the genre of *Maghāzī* is better than the rest of what he narrates; although the overall evaluation of his narrations is that he is weak.¹

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq has narrated with ‘an‘anah and not with *Samā’*. Ibn ‘Asākir pointed out the weakness after narrating it (59/205). He said:

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq and Salamah ibn al-Faḍl have Shī‘ī leanings.

As for the content: what need would Abū Sufyān and Mu‘āwiyah have to steal this lady’s camel when each of them had been given 100 camels by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ on the day of Ḥunayn, as well as other wealth?!²

1 See *al-Kāmil* of Ibn ‘Adī (2/210)+

2 See *al-Rowḍ al-Unuf* of al-Suhaylī (3/408).

The Fifth Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Killed Twenty of the Participants of Badr at Şifḥīn

In response to this I say: very few of the Şaḥābah were present at Şifḥīn. It has even been said that only Khuzaymah ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه was present.

Aḥmad narrates in *al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl* (1/287), Ibn ‘Adī in *al-Kāmil* (239) and *al-Ḍu‘afā’* (1/59), al-Khallal in *al-Sunnah* (2/465) and al-Khaṭīb in his *Tārīkh* (6/113) by way of Umayyah ibn Khālīd who said:

It was mentioned to Shu‘bah that Abū Shaybah narrates from al-Ḥakam — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Layla that he said, “Seventy of the participants of Badr were present at Şifḥīn,” to which he remarked, “by Allah, he has erred! I had revised with Ḥakam in his own home and we could not name anyone other than Khuzaymah ibn Thābit from the participants of Badr who were present at Şifḥīn.”¹

Aḥmad narrates in *al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl* (1/431) — from Rowḥ — who said:

Shu‘bah related to us, “I had revised with Ḥakam in his own home and we could not find anyone of the participants at Badr who were present at Şifḥīn other than Khuzaymah ibn Thābit.”

Shu‘bah would reject the fact Abū al-Haytham ibn Tayyḥān was present at Şifḥīn.

Al-Dhahabī said:

I say, ‘Ammār and ‘Alī were also present.²

Ibn Kathīr said:

1 The chain of this is sound.

2 *al-Siyar* (7/221)

It has been said that Sahl ibn Ḥunayf, from the participants at Badr, was present, as well as Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī. Our teacher, the scholar, Ibn Taymiyyah, has said so in his book *al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah*.¹

What further attests to this is that which has been narrated by Ibn Abī al-Dunyā in *al-‘Uzlah wa l-Infirād* (9), Ibn Baṭṭah in *al-Ibānah al-Kubrā* (2/596) and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Tamhīd* (17/442) by way of Ibn Lahī‘ah — from Sayyār ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān who said:

Bukayr ibn al-Ashajj said to me, “what has your (maternal) uncle done?” I said, “he has remained in his home since such-and-such a time.” He responded, “indeed so many a person from the participants at Badr have remained in their homes after the murder of ‘Uthmān and they did not leave except to their graves.”²

Aḥmad narrates in *al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl* (3/182), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/446) and Ibn Shabah in *Akḥbār al-Madīnah* (2286) by way of Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Ulayyah — who said — Ayyūb related to us from Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn, who said:

The fitnah became fierce and the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ numbered over ten thousand. Not even one hundred participated; nay, they did not even reach thirty in number.

Ibn Taymiyyah states in *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* (6/236):

... and this chain is from the most authentic on the face of the earth.

He states further (6/237):

This unambiguous statement indicates the minimal number of participants at Badr who were present (at Ṣifḥīn). It has been said that Sahl ibn Ḥunayf

1 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/491)

2 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (7/179), In this chain is Ibn Lahī‘ah.

and Abū Ayyūb were present, the opinion of Ibn Sīrīn is similar and he could not possibly count one hundred.

Maʿmar narrates in his *Jāmiʿ* (20735) — from Ayyūb — from Ibn Sīrīn who said:

The fitnah broke out and the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ numbered over ten thousand; but not even forty of them stood to participate.

Maʿmar said:

Others have stated that two-hundred and forty odd of them stood with him¹ — ʿAlī رضي الله عنه — from the participants of Badr, among them Abū Ayyūb, Sahl ibn Ḥunayf and ʿAmmār.

Al-Ḥākim narrated it in *al-Mustadrak* (5/627) by way of him (Maʿmar) except that the final comment had been attributed Ibn Sīrīn; whereas it is actually the statement of Maʿmar ibn Rāshid al-Baṣrī.

I say that the statement of two-hundred and forty plus, from the participants of Badr being present at Ṣiffīn is rejected on account of numerous reasons.

- a. It is not known who said that; and the ascription of it by al-Ḥākim to Ibn Sīrīn is an oversight since he narrates it by way of Maʿmar. Maʿmar states in his *Jāmiʿ* that someone other than Ibn Sīrīn mentioned this.
- b. This contradicts what has been narrated in the reliable reports that very few of the Ṣaḥābah, better still the participants at Badr, were present at Ṣiffīn. This has been proven from the narrations that were presented earlier.

Ṣiffīn was an encounter that very few of the participants at Badr were present for. Maʿmar narrates (20739) and Aḥmad in *al-ʿIlal wa Maʿrifat al-Rijāl* (4331) by way of

1 See *al-Mustadrak* of al-Ḥākim (5/627)

Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd, from Ibn al-Mūsāyyib who said:

The first fitnah broke out and none of the participants of Badr remained; the second fitnah broke out and there remained none from the participants at Ḥudaybiyyah. Had there been a third fitnah there would not have been among the people one who used to cook.¹

Al-Bukhārī narrated it (3800) with a muʿallaq chain, endorsing its reliability, by way of al-Layth — from Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd with the same chain. He interpreted the first fitnah as the murder of ʿUthmān and the second — the incident at al-Ḥarrah.

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (7/325):

Meaning that — they had passed away since the murder of ʿUthmān; until the second fitnah broke out at al-Ḥarrah.

Ibn Shabah narrates in *Akhbār al-Madīnah* (2285) by way of Saʿīd ibn ʿĀmir — who said — Hishām narrated to us — from Muḥammad who said:

The fitnah broke out in Madīnah and the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ numbered over ten thousand; yet none of them got involved save thirty.

To that extent, the incident of al-Jamal was not attended by the Ṣaḥābah except a few among them. Ibn Kathīr states in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/474):

In both camps there were very few Ṣaḥābah.

Ibn Abī Shaybah narrates in his *Muṣannaf* (7/538) by way of Ibn ʿUlayyah, from Manṣūr ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, from al-Shaʿbī:

¹ This chain is authentic.

None participated in al-Jamal from the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ besides ‘Alī, ‘Ammār, Ṭalḥah, and Zubayr; and if there were a fifth then I am a liar.¹

It has also been narrated by al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/466), and Aḥmad in *al-‘Ilal* (3/45) by way of Sufyān — from Maṣṣūr — from al-Sha‘bī²; and its chain is authentic.

Ibn Kathīr states in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/474):

‘Ā’ishah was present, as was Ibn Zubayr, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, Sahl ibn Ḥunayf among others.

He stated in *Ikhtīṣār ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (2/500):

It is said that in both camps there were no more than one hundred Ṣaḥābah; and Aḥmad said that they were not even thirty.

The Sixth Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah Poisoned Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī

This is one of the most famous fables that have been attributed to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.³

Ibn ‘Asakir reported it in his *Tārīkh* (13/284) — from Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn Marzubān — from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Thumāmī⁴ — from Muḥammad ibn Salām al-

1 This chain is authentic.

2 See *Tārīkh Dimashq* (42/460)

3 See *al-Ṣuḥbah wa al-Ṣaḥābah* of al-Mālikī (pg. 132)

4 In *al-Muntaẓam* of Ibn al-Jowzī (5/226) the name is given as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Yemānī [the script is very close of both names – Translator]

Jumahī — from Ibn Ja‘dubah¹ — who said:

Ja‘dah ibn al-Ash‘ath ibn al-Qays was married to Ḥasan; so Yazīd wrote secretly to her to poison Ḥasan and he promised to marry her thereafter. So she fulfilled his request and after the demise of Ḥasan and the expiry of her ‘iddah she wrote to him; asking him to fulfil his part of the agreement and he responded that she could not be trusted with Ḥasan, how could he trust her for himself.²

This has also been narrated by Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Muntaẓam* (5/226). See also *al-Wāfi* by al-Ṣafadī (4/162), *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* of al-Suyūṭī (169) — who mentioned it without a chain. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Istī‘āb* (389), Ibn Khālikān in *Wafīyyāt al-A‘yān* (6612), Ibn al-Athīr in *al-Kāmil* (3/315) and al-Dhahabī in *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (5/267) have all mentioned that his wife Ja‘dah ibn al-Ash‘ath is the one who poisoned him.

To respond to this lie I say:

1. If this incident can be established, it applies to Yazīd and not Mu‘āwiyah.
2. Ḥasan رضي الله عنه willingly handed over the khilāfah to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, what need was there to poison him if there was no fear of harm from him?

Ibn al-‘Arabī said in *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (214):

If it is said he secretly conspired to have Ḥasan poisoned we say that this claim is far-fetched for two reasons, one of them was the fact that Ḥasan handed over the khilāfah willingly and there was no incentive for Mu‘āwiyah to have Ḥasan killed. Secondly the narration regarding it is unreliable and a number of scholars have identified flaws in the narration.

1 In *al-Muntaẓam* (5/226) the name is given as Ibn Ja‘dah, this is an error.

2 See *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (6/253)

He states further in *al-ʿAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (214) regarding the allegation that Muʿāwiyah poisoned Ḥasan عليه السلام:

It is a matter of the unseen known only to Allah. How can you place the blame on Muʿāwiyah without any proof; especially after such a long time? We cannot rely on a spurious report that has been transmitted among people of innovation; especially during a time of fitnah when each party ascribes to the next that which is inappropriate. So nothing will be accepted of (such reports) except that which is evidently clear, and it will not be heard (taken) except from one with great moral integrity.

Ibn Khaldūn states in his *Tārīkh* (2/187):

As for what has been reported that Muʿāwiyah secretly conspired with his wife, Jaʿdah bint al-Ashʿath, for him to be poisoned; it is from the narrations of the Shīʿah and how far Muʿāwiyah is from doing such a terrible act!

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr al-Barrī states in his book *al-Jowharah* (282):

This matter is not known to anyone besides Allah. It is highly unlikely that Muʿāwiyah would be responsible for it. It has been said that Yazīd was the one who conspired with his wife; and both narratives have been transmitted by the historians.

Ibn Taymiyyah, in his *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/469), in refutation of Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar says:

As for his statement that Muʿāwiyah had Ḥasan poisoned then this is what some people have said, but is not proven with reliable evidence or reasonable admission, nor any report which can be trusted. So this is a matter that cannot be known and any statement regarding it would be a statement without sound knowledge... and in general cannot be admissible in terms of the sharīʿah by consensus.

Al-Balādhurī in his *Ansāb* (3/295) narrates in a passive voice (indicating weakness of the narration) and mentions it without a chain:

... and it has been said that Mu'āwiyah secretly conspired with Ja'dah bint al-Ash'ath ibn Qays, the wife of Ḥasan, to have him poisoned. He encouraged her until she used to ridicule him.¹

Al-Dhahabī said in *Tārīkh al-Islām*:

This is a matter that is not correct; who was there to see it?

Ibn Kathīr says in *al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah* (11/208):

Some of them have narrated that Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah wrote to Ja'dah to poison Ḥasan and he will marry her afterwards. So she carried it out, and after Ḥasan passed away she sent a message to him (Yazīd) and he replied, “we could not trust you with Ḥasan; do you think we could trust you for ourselves?” In my opinion this is not authentic; and it being incorrect regarding his father, Mu'āwiyah, is even more appropriate.

The Seventh Allegation

Mu'āwiyah Killed 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd²

To respond to this false allegation I say: al-Ṭabarī has narrated in his *Tārīkh* (3/202) by way of 'Umar ibn Shabbah — from 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Madā'inī — from Maslamah ibn Muḥārib:

'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn al-Walīd had gained much prominence in al-Shām, and the peoples' hearts were inclined towards him on account of their sentiments towards his father, Khālīd ibn al-Walīd; and on account of his defence of the Muslims in the Roman territories and his strength

1 Al-Mas'udi narrates it without any discretion in *Murūj al-Dhahab* (1/346) and Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī in *Muqātil al-Ṭalībīn* (13) and both of them are accused (of fabrication).

2 See his biographical details in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/173)

and might. Mu'āwiyah was cautious of him and feared for himself, and the position he held in the hearts of the people. So Mu'āwiyah instructed Ibn Uthāl to devise a plan to have him, 'Abd al-Raḥmān, killed and guaranteed that if he succeeds in killing him will have the taxes lifted from him — the assassin — for the rest of his life. In addition to this he will make him responsible for collecting the taxes in Ḥimṣ. So when 'Abd al-Raḥmān arrived in Ḥimṣ, on his return from the Roman territories, Ibn Uthāl had him poisoned by giving one of his slaves a poisoned drink which resulted in the death of 'Abd al-Raḥmān. So Mu'āwiyah fulfilled his promise and waived the taxes from him and appointed him in charge of the collection of the land taxes of Ḥimṣ.¹

This narration is unreliable. Appearing in the chain is Maslamah ibn Muḥarib — his ascription is al-Ziyādī — and the issue with him is his anonymity as a narrator. He narrates from his father and Ibn Jurayj; and from al-Madā'inī. None have ratified him besides Ibn Ḥibbān². Al-Bukhārī and Ibn Abī Ḥātim³ have listed him without mentioning any impugning comments, nor any endorsement. Furthermore, Maslamah ibn Muḥarib was not present during the occurrence of this alleged incident and he does not narrate from Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه except through an intermediary — his father — which is a clear indicator that the incident has been narrated via an interrupted chain.⁴

Another narrator in this chain, 'Alī ibn Muḥammad, Abū Sayf, al-Madā'inī al-Anbārī has been criticised and his status as a narrator is disputed. Ibn Ma'in has endorsed him; al-Dhahabī states in *al-Siyar* (10/401):

He was a wonder in terms of his knowledge of the military expeditions, genealogy and the history of the Arabs; and he was honest in what he transmitted.

1 See *al-Amthāl* (36) of al-Qāsim ibn Sallām, *Usd al-Ghābah* (693) and *al-Kāmil* (3/309) of Ibn al-Athīr

2 *Al-Thiqāt* (7/490)

3 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (7/387), *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (8/266)

4 See the above references.

On the other hand, Ibn ‘Adī said of him in *al-Kāmil* (5/213):

He was not strong in ḥadīth, he was a person of historical narrations. Very few a narration did he have with a proper chain.

Therefore, al-Ṭabarī’s narration of it in the passive voice (3/202) which indicates the weakness of what is being reported. It has also been narrated by Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī in *al-Aghānī*, and al-Balādhurī in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (5/118) (16/209) and it is unreliable. Ibn Kathīr states in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/174):

Some have claimed that Mu‘āwiyah conspired to have him killed, but it is not correct.

The Eighth Allegation

Mu‘āwiyah’s Killing of Ḥujr Ibn ‘Adī

There is a difference of opinion regarding the status of Ḥujr Ibn ‘Adī, whether he is a Ṣaḥābī or a Ṭābi‘ī. Ibn Sa‘d has mentioned him in the fourth category of Ṣaḥābah and has mentioned that he had once visited the Prophet ﷺ. Thereafter he mentioned him in the first category of Ṭābi‘īn of the people of Kūfah. Al-Bukhārī, ibn Abī Ḥātim (in what he relates from his father), Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ and Ibn Ḥibbān all mention him among the Ṭābi‘īn. Abū Aḥmad al-‘Askarī has said:

Majority of the scholars of ḥadīth do not consider him to be from the Ṣaḥābah.¹

Ḥujr Ibn ‘Adī was among those who rallied against Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as mentioned in *Ṭabaqāt ibn Sa‘d* (6/151), *al-Istī‘āb* (174), *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* (3/462) *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/229) and *al-Iṣābah* (2/37).

1 See *al-Ṭabaqāt* (6/217) of Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/228) and *al-Iṣābah* (1/313)

Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه made clear his excuse for having him killed. Al-Balādhurī¹ narrates in *al-Ansāb* (2/169) and Ibn 'Asākir in his *Tārīkh* (12/230) with a chain to ibn Abī Mulaykah who said:

Mu'āwiyah had come to the home of 'Ā'ishah and sought permission to enter and she refused to allow him to enter. A slave of hers named Dhakwān came out and Mu'āwiyah said to him, “let me in, for she is displeased with me!” Her slave was still with her when she permitted him to enter and he was more obedient to her than I. The moment he entered he said, “O my beloved mother, what causes you to be angry with me?” She responded, “my displeasure is on account of your killing Ḥujr Ibn 'Adī and his companions.” So he said to her, “as for Ḥujr and his companions I had feared unrest and communal strife. I feared that innocent blood would be spilt and that which is sanctified would be transgressed. Leave me unto Allah and let Him do with me as He sees fit.” She responded, “I have left you by Allah,” repeating it thrice.

Ibn 'Asākir states in his *Tārīkh* (12/229) by way of Aḥmad — from 'Affān — from Ismā'īl ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Ulayyah — from Ayyūb — from 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Mulaykah:

When Mu'āwiyah came to visit 'Ā'ishah she said to him, “have you killed Ḥujr?” He replied, “O Mother of the Believers I found that the greater interest of the people lay in killing him, rather than keeping him alive and allowing harm to come to them.”

Ibn al-'Arabī states in *al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (211):

If it is said that he killed Ḥujr — a Ṣaḥābī well-known for his righteousness — while he was imprisoned (and Ziyād says) 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها sent to him trying

1 Translators note – the reader might have found that the author has objected to many narrations quoted by al-Balādhurī throughout this book and here he is quoting him to support his viewpoint. This seems contradictory at face-value. However, consideration is always given to the chain of transmission in establishing the reliability, not merely the book unless the book's purpose is specific.

to intervene in the matter of Ḥujr; we say that we are all well aware of the fact that Ḥujr was killed. However, we dispute by some saying this was done unjustly and others saying that there was justification for his killing. If it is said that the original case is that he was killed unjustly unless proven otherwise, we say that the original case is that the leader kills on a justified basis unless evidence points to the contrary. However, according to what was said, Ḥujr had seen some undesirable behaviour from Ziyād and he began to throw pebbles at him and abandoned his gathering and wanted to turn the community against him. So Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه saw this as one who is causing an uprising. 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها spoke to him (Mu'āwiyah) during the time he embarked on the pilgrimage and he said to her, “leave me and Ḥujr until we stand before Allah.” As for you, O assembly of Muslims, it is more befitting that you leave them until they both appear before Allah, with their just companion. Leave your speculations since you lack in judgment, why is it that you do not listen?¹

The Ninth Allegation

The Allegation of Mu'āwiyah Killing al-Ashtar Mālīk Ibn al-Ḥārith al-Nakha'ī

This is from the fabrications that have been conjured up regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and how many they are! It appears in the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd (6/213):

Al-Ashtar was from the companions of 'Alī and he witnessed al-Jamal, Ṣiffīn and all the expeditions with him. He was appointed by 'Alī over Egypt. When he passed by al-'Arīsh enroute to Egypt he had some honey and died.

Al-Dhahabī states in *al-Siyar* (4/34):

After 'Alī returned from Ṣiffīn, he prepared al-Ashtar as the governor over Egypt. However he passed away before he could reach on account of

1 For further reading see the book on Mu'āwiyah by Dr 'Alī al-Ṣallābī.

being poisoned. It has been said that a slave that belonged to 'Uthmān was behind it, and poisoned his honey.

Ibn Ḥajar mentions in *al-Iṣābah* (6/162):

He narrated from 'Umar, Khālīd ibn al-Walīd, Abū Dharr and 'Alī. He accompanied him and participated in al-Jamal and Ṣiffīn and he was very prominent in these expeditions. He was appointed to govern over Egypt after the dismissal of Qays ibn 'Ubādah. When he reached al-Qalzam he had a sip of honey and died soon after. It was said that it had been poisoned. This occurred in the year 38 A.H.

There is absolutely no mention of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه in any of this. Al-Tabarī narrates a report in his *Tārīkh* (3/127):

... so Mu'āwiyah sent for al-Jābistār — who was a person who paid Kharāj (land tax on non-Muslims) — and said to him, “indeed al-Ashtar has been given Egypt to govern. If you suffice me of him I will exempt you of Kharāj as long as I live. So use whatever ploy you have at your disposal.” So al-Jābistār left until he came to al-Qalzam and he settled there for a while. When al-Ashtar departed from Iraq toward Egypt he passed by al-Qalzam and was met by al-Jābistār who said, “here is a place to rest, here is food, and fodder for your animals,” so the chieftain brought food for him and fodder for the animals. After his meals he brought him a drink sweetened with honey which he had poisoned and offered it to him to drink which he did, and died as a result of it.

I say: this narration is from the narrations of Abū Mikhnaḥ Lūt ibn Yaḥyā, the confounded fabricator of history. His situation as a narrator has been previously dealt with. Therefore Ibn 'Asākir quotes this narration in the passive voice indicating its unreliability.¹

1 *Tārīkh Dimashq* (49/428) (56/375) (56/388) (56/389) (56/391) and there is no mention of Mu'āwiyah.

Al-Balādhurī has mentioned this incident in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (3/168) without any chain and in it appears:

The news of his death reached Mu‘āwiyah... and he said: “Indeed Allah has soldiers in honey as well.”

He then mentions a similar story with a similar narrative by way of Wahb ibn Jarīr — from Ibn Ja‘dabah — from Šālīḥ ibn Kaysān and in it appears:

When he reached ‘Ayn al-Shams he drank a drink [sweetened] by honey — which is said to have been poisoned — and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ commented: “Indeed Allah has soldiers in honey.”

Again, there is no mention of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

The Tenth Allegation

The Allegation That Mu‘āwiyah Instituted the Cursing of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib

There is no reliable report that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه cursed ‘Alī رضي الله عنه; this has been clearly mentioned by al-Qurṭubī and Ibn Kathīr. Al-Qurṭubī states in *al-Mufhim* (6/278):

It is farfetched that Mu‘āwiyah would openly curse and abuse him on account of what Mu‘āwiyah had been described with in terms of intelligence, religiousness, forbearance, and general good manners. As for what has been narrated of him in this regard most of it is a lie and unfounded.

Ibn Kathīr says in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (10/576):

None of it is reliable regarding them.

Muslim narrates (2404) in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* by way of ‘Āmir ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqas

reported on the authority of his father:

Mu‘āwiyah called for him (Sa‘d) and said, “what prevents you from abusing Abu al-Turāb,” whereupon he said, “it is because of three things which I remember Allah’s Messenger ﷺ having said about him that I would not abuse him and even if I find one of those three things for me, it would be more dear to me than red camels. I heard Allah’s Messenger ﷺ say about ‘Alī as he left him behind in one of his campaigns. ‘Alī said to him, ‘O Messenger of Allah, you leave me behind along with women and children?’ Thereupon Allah’s Messenger ﷺ said to him, ‘are you not pleased with being unto me what Hārūn was unto Mūsā but with this exception that there is no prophet after me.’ And I (also) heard him say on the Day of Khaybar, ‘I would certainly give this standard to a person who loves Allah and his Messenger, and Allah and his Messenger love him too.’ We had been anxiously waiting for it, when he (the Prophet) said, ‘call ‘Alī,’ he was called and his eyes were inflamed. He applied saliva to his eyes and handed over the standard to him, and Allah gave him victory. (The third occasion is this) when the (following) verse was revealed, ‘let us summon our children and your children...’ Allah’s Messenger ﷺ called ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and said, ‘O Allah, they are my family.’”

The response to this allegation is as follows:

1. The statement of Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه to Sa‘d رضى الله عنه, “what prevents you from abusing Abu al-Turāb?” could be interpreted as why did you not criticise his ijtihād and point out the correctness of my ijtihād, and Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ was one of those who stayed out of the fitnah.
2. Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه wanted to know the position of Sa‘d رضى الله عنه with regards to ‘Alī رضى الله عنه so he asked him the reason that prevented him from criticising, was it out of reverence for him [‘Alī] or was it out of fear or piety.
3. If Mu‘āwiyah رضى الله عنه really wanted to curse ‘Alī رضى الله عنه he would not have asked of that from Sa‘d رضى الله عنه since he was one of those who did not get involved

in the internal conflict. Furthermore, it has been established via authentic narrations that he, Sa'd, prayed against those who cursed 'Alī عليه السلام and Allah accepted that supplication.¹ So how can Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام demand that he curse 'Alī عليه السلام?

Al-Nawawī, in his commentary on *Muslim* (15/175), states:

This statement of Mu'āwiyah does not clearly mean that he requested him to curse 'Alī. Rather, he asked the reason that prevents him from cursing. It is as if he is saying: Have you withheld out of piety, fear or any other reason; so if it is out of piety and reverence for him then you have adopted the correct policy and if for any other reason there is a different response. Perhaps Sa'd was with a group who used to curse but refrained from cursing and was not in a position to rebuke them so he asked the question prompting him, and thus providing the opportunity to object to those who were cursing. Some have said that it has the potential for an alternative interpretation and that it means why did you not object to his ijtihād and make apparent to the people the correctness of our opinion and ijtihād?

Al-Qurṭubī said in *al-Mufhim* (6/276):

This is not clear in that he demanded that he be cursed. Instead it was a question regarding what was holding him back from doing so, so that he could bring out his virtues or the opposite as was clear from his response. When Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام heard that he remained silent and acknowledged the right for what it was.

Al-Balādhurī has mentioned an incident of this nature in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (5/124) with no chain and said:

1 See *al-Siyar* (1/116) regarding the incident of the man who abused 'Alī and Sa'd prohibited him but the person did not stop, so Sa'd prayed against him and no sooner did he complete that a camel came and stomped him until he died. Al-Dhahabī then said, there are many chains of transmission for this incident which have been narrated by Ibn Abī al-Dunya in *Mujābī al-Du'ā*.

Mu'āwiyah delivered a sermon one day and mentioned 'Alī in a derogatory manner...

He narrated again (5/30) with a chain from al-Madā'inī —, from 'Abd Allāh ibn Fā'id and Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ, who both said:

Mu'āwiyah wrote to al-Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah, "curse 'Alī openly and ridicule him" so he wrote back saying, "I do not like of you, O Amīr al-Mu'minīn, that whenever you find a fault with someone you ridicule him, and whenever you get angry you hit, and there is no barrier of tolerance between that and you, and you do not bring forth your pardon!"

Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ he is Abū al-Yaqẓān al-'Ujayfī. I have not found anyone endorsing statements regarding him nor any disparaging statement except the statement of al-Mizzī in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (8/216):

A narrator of history and Suḥaym is his title and his name is 'Āmir.

As well as the statement of Ibn Nadīm in his *Fihrist* (138):

He was knowledgeable with regards to historical reports, genealogy, the merits and virtues, and he was reliable."

'Abd Allāh ibn Fā'id in this chain he is the same person, Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ.

Al-Khaṭīb has narrated in *Mūdhīh Awhām al-Jam' wal-Tafrīq* (2/165) by way of al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār — who said — a reliable man narrated to me — saying:

Abū al-Hasan al-Madā'inī narrated to me, Abū al-Yaqẓān is Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ, and Suḥaym is a title of his and his name is 'Āmir ibn Ḥaḥṣ. Ḥaḥṣ had a son called Muḥammad who was the eldest but did not take his agnomen from him. Ḥaḥṣ was very dark in complexion and was known as al-Aswad. Abū al-Yaqẓān said to me my mother named me with 15 names. So if I say Abū al-Yaqẓān narrated to us, then it is Abū al-Yaqẓān, and if I said

Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ, or ‘Amir ibn Ḥaḥṣ, or ‘Āmir ibn Abī Muḥammad, or ‘Āmir ibn al-Aswad, or Suḥāym ibn al-Aswad, or ‘Abd Allāh ibn Fā’id or Abū Ishāq al-Mālikī then it refers to Abū al-Yaqzān.¹

Al-Sakhāwī mentioned him in *Fath al-Mughith* among those narrators who had numerous titles.

Also, Suḥaym ibn Ḥaḥṣ did not meet with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, rather he was born a long time after the reign of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; Suḥaym passed away in 190 A.H.

Even if this was proven of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه it would be considered either a sin, or an erroneous ijtihād which could be forgiven with repentance or righteous deeds which erase the evil deeds.

Ibn Taymiyyah has written in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/368) in refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Rāfiḍī:

As for what he has mentioned regarding the cursing of ‘Alī, then the cursing occurred on both sides as the fighting occurred. And all of this, whether a sin, or an incorrect ijtihād, the Forgiveness of Allah is achieved through repentance and righteous deeds that erase the evil ones, as well as tribulations that compensate for all of that.

The Eleventh Allegation

The Condemnation of Mu‘āwiyah by Abū Bakrah, Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and al-Aswad ibn Yazīd

As for the narration of Abū Bakrah it has been narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (62/217) and al-Mizzī in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* (30/7) by way of Howdhah ibn Khalīfah — who said — ‘Awf ibn narrated to me — from Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī — who said:

¹ See *al-Kifāyah* (366) and *Fath al-Mughith* (3/212)

I was a close friend of Abū Bakrah and he once said, “do people think that that I rebuke them on account of worldly matters whilst they have appointed ‘Ubayd Allāh (referring to his son, over Fāris), and Rawwād (referring to his son, over the public granary) and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (referring to his son, over the stipends and the public treasury) is it not that all of them have of the world. I swear by Allah that I have condemned them because they have disbelieved without any ambiguity.

Assuming the authenticity of the above statement it can be responded to in a number of ways:

1. It is not explicit that Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه said this regarding Mu‘āwiyah. Rather, it was said in reference to Ziyād ibn Abīhī.

Ibn ‘Asākir, in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (62/217), narrates by way of Abū Bakr ibn Khaythamah — from Howdhah ibn Khalīfah — who said — Hishām ibn Ḥassān said to us — from Hasan — who said:

Anas ibn Mālik passed by me and Ziyād had sent him to Abū Bakrah to admonish him so I went with him and we entered upon the old man and he was unwell, and it was said to him that Ziyād said, “have I not appointed ‘Ubayd Allāh over Fāris, and Rawwād over the granary, and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān over the stipends and the public treasury?” to which Abū Bakrah responded, “has he not gone any further and entered them into the Fire?” So Anas responded, “I do not know him except to have exercised his discretionary judgement.” So Abū Bakrah said, “sit me up, I do not know him except to have exercised his ijtihād? And the people of Ḥarūrāh, they also used their ijtihād, were they correct or did they err?” So Anas said, “we return having been beaten in argumentation.”

Likewise it is narrated by Ṣāliḥ in *Masā’il al-Imām Aḥmad* (2/432).

In this chain is Hishām ibn Ḥassān al-Azdī, Mowla al-Qarādīs, the group has narrated of his narration, he is reliable himself except that his narrations from Ḥasan is interrupted by a missing link.

* Ismā'īl ibn 'Ulayyah said: “We gave no consideration to the narration of Hishām ibn Ḥassān from Ḥasan.”¹

* 'Abbād ibn Maṣṣūr said: “I have not seen Hishām with Ḥasan ever.”

* Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim said: “I sat with Ḥasan for seven years, not once did I see Hishām with him.”

* He also said: “I spent seven years in the company of Ḥasan; never did I miss his gathering, even for a day. I would fast and go to him. Not once did I see Hishām with him.”

* Mu'ādh ibn Mu'ādh states: “Shu'bah avoided the narration of Hishām ibn Ḥassān when he narrated from 'Aṭā', Muḥammad and Ḥasan.”

* 'Amr ibn 'Ubayd said: “I have never seen Hishām with Ḥasan, nor did he ever accompany us to (the lessons) of Ḥasan.”²

2. Assuming that Abū Bakrah did say that with regards to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, then why did he stay out of the fitnah and not fight him if he believed him to be on kufr?

Al-Bukhārī narrates (31) by way of Ḥasan — from al-Aḥnaf ibn Qays — from Abū Bakrah who said:

I went to assist this man when Abū Bakrah met with me on the way and said, “where do you intend going?” I said, “to assist this man,” and he said, “return for indeed I have heard the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم saying, ‘if two Muslims face each other with their swords, then the killer and killed will be in the Fire.’ So I said, ‘O Messenger of Allah, the killer is to be understood, but what about the killed?’ He responded, ‘he was ready to kill his companion.’”

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (4/268)

2 *Ibid*

Was Abū Bakrah رضي الله عنه unaware of the Prophet's صلی الله علیه وسلم praise for Ḥasan رضي الله عنه in his prevention of the spilling blood, and his abdication in favour of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه since it is he who narrated the ḥadīth, “Indeed this son of mine is a sayyid...” and still he considers Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه a disbeliever?!

Ibn Taymiyyah, in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, (4/466) said:

Since the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم praised the reconciliation and abandoning the fighting; it indicated that the reconciliation between both parties was more beloved to Allah than their fighting. Hence, it indicates that the fighting between these two parties was not that with which Allah commanded. Furthermore, were Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه a disbeliever, then nominating him and abdicating in favour of him would not have been pleasing to Allah and His Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم. Instead, this narration proves that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his party were believers; and that which had been done by Ḥasan was praiseworthy in the sight of Allah, pleasing to Him and His Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم.

The senior Ṣaḥābah who fought Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه on the Day of Ṣiffīn did not even consider him a disbeliever, like 'Alī and 'Ammār رضي الله عنه. Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī narrates in *Ta'zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (361) by way of Qays ibn Muslim — from Ṭāriq ibn Shihāb who said:

I was with 'Alī when the fighting ended at Nahrawān and it was said to him, “are they polytheists?” to which he replied, “it was polytheism from which they fled.” Then it was said, “hypocrites?” and he responded, “hypocrites do not remember Allah, except a little.” Then it was asked what they were and he replied, “a group of people who rebelled against us and we fought them.”¹

Ibn Abī Shaybah narrates in his *Muṣannaf* (19687) by way of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥakam al-Nakha'ī, from Riyāḥ ibn al-Ḥārith who said:

1 The chain is authentic.

A person came to ‘Ammār saying, “by Allah, the people of Shām have committed disbelief,” and ‘Ammār responded saying, “do not say that! Our Qiblah is one, our Prophet is one. However, they are a group that has been tested so it is our duty to fight them to bring them back onto the right.”

He narrates further (19689) and Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī in *Ta’zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (364) by way of Mis‘ar — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Riyāḥ — who said — that ‘Ammar رضي الله عنه said:

Do not say that the people of al-Ṣhām have disbelieved, say they have transgressed, they have exceeded the bounds.¹

Muḥammad ibn Naṣr al-Marwazī states in *Ta’zīm Qadr al-Ṣalah* (426):

The Muslims fought on the Day of Jamal and on Siffīn, and the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم from the Muhājirīn and Anṣār were present, and they had fought one another. However, none of them considered the opposition to be disbelievers; neither did they consider lawful each others’ property. There were also those who abstained from the infighting from the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, they also did not accuse any of the parties of disbelief. Neither did any party consider the prayer and supplication of the other to be void on account of what occurred between them, nor did they consider the wives of their opposition unlawful (on account of disbelief).

As for the Ḥasan al-Baṣrī’s condemnation of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه it is not reliably established from him. Al-Ṭabarī (3/232) narrates in his *Tārīkh* by way of Abū Mikhnaḥ — from al-Ṣaq‘ab ibn Zuhayr — from Ḥasan al-Baṣrī that he said:

There are four characteristics in Mu‘āwiyah, of which even one is sufficient to be a cause for destruction: He took the mantle of leadership without consultation whilst the other senior Ṣaḥābah were still alive; he made his drunkard son — who used to wear silk garments and play musical instruments — his successor; he endorsed the lineage of Ziyād whereas

¹ The chain is authentic.

the Prophet ﷺ said that the child is attributed to the one in whose bed he is born, and for the fornicator there is stoning; finally his killing of Ḥujr and the companions of Ḥujr. Woe unto him regarding Ḥujr! Woe unto him regarding Ḥujr! Woe unto him regarding Ḥujr and the companions of Ḥujr!

This chain is baseless; in it is Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā, the confounded narrator of history whose details have been expounded upon earlier. Ibn Kathīr mentions it (8/90) in the passive voice indicating its unreliability.

What is correctly transmitted from Hasan al-Baṣrī is the opposite of this. Al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharīḥ* (5/2468), Ibn ‘Asākir in his *Tārīkh* (59/206) narrate by way of Qatādah — from Ḥasan that some people had testified that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his companions are in the Fire and he said, “may Allah curse them, what gives them the idea that he is in the Fire?”

Ibn ‘Asākir (59/206) narrates by way of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik in Abī al-Shawārib — who said — Bishr ibn al-Faḍl narrated to us — from Ab al-Ashhab who said that it was said to Ḥasan that some people cursed Mu‘āwiyah and Ibn Zubayr. He responded:

May the curse of Allah be upon those who are swearing and cursing them!¹

As for the narration attributed to al-Aswad ibn Yazīd it has been narrated by Ibn ‘Asākir (59/158) by way of Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī — from Ayyūb ibn Jābir — from Abū Ishāq — from al-Aswad ibn Yazīd, who said:

I said to ‘Ā’ishah, “are you not amazed at some of the *Ṭulaqā* (those who accepted Islam after the conquest of Makkah) who compete with the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ in matters of state?” She asked, “what was strange in that. It is the authority of Allah, He can give it to the righteous

1 This chain is authentic.

and wretched and the Pharaoh ruled over the people of Egypt for four hundred years.”

However, this chain is unreliable. In it is Ayyūb ibn Jābir, Abū Sulaymān al-Yamāmī, who is weak according to the scholars of ḥadīth. He is considered weak by Ibn Maʿīn, Ibn al-Madīnī, al-Nasāʾī, Abū Zurʿah, Abū Ḥāṭim, Yaʿqūb ibn Sufyān and Muʿāwiyah ibn Ṣāliḥ.¹

* Ibn Ḥibbān said: “He used to err in such abundance that he was excluded from those whose narrations were relied upon.”²

* Imām Aḥmad said: “His narrations resembled the narrations of the people of honesty.”

* Ibn ʿAdī said: “Much of the narrations of Ayyub ibn Jābir are fine, and of an acceptable norm, some give strength to others, one may record ḥadīth from him.”³

There is also the matter of anonymity with regards to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥya ibn Yāsir al-Jowbarī, he died in the year 425. Al-Dhahabī has mentioned him in *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* (17/415) without stating whether he was sound or weak.⁴

Ibn Taymiyyah has written in *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (4/453):

The faith of Muʿāwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه is established through mass transmitted reports and the consensus of the people of knowledge; as is the faith of his peers from those who embraced the religion after the Conquest of Makkah, like his brother Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān, and the likes

1 See *al-Tahdhīb* (1/201)

2 *Al-Majrūḥīn* (1/167)

3 *Al-Kāmil* (1/355)

4 See also *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ* (3/1076)

of Suhayl ibn ‘Amr, Ṣafwān ibn Umayyah among others. This group of Muslims were referred to as the Ṭulaqā’. They had been named such since their acceptance was only after the Conquest of Makkah and after they were encouraged by the Prophet ﷺ through his generosity towards them so that he could win their hearts. It has been narrated that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه accepted Islam before that and undertook the hijrah as did Khālīd ibn al-Walīd, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and ‘Uthmān ibn Ṭalḥah. If this is correct that he ought to be considered among the Muhājir Muslims. As for his Islam at the occasion of the Conquest then there is no dispute regarding that among the scholars. The only difference is whether it was before the Conquest or at the Conquest. However, there are some liars who claim that he wished to undermine his father by his Islam, but this is a clear lie by the unanimous agreement of the scholars of ḥadīth. As for those who have been mentioned, they were among the best of those who accepted Islam and among those who have the best character. They were not accused of any evil, and none of the scholars accused them of hypocrisy as others had been accused of. On the contrary, they displayed excellence of Islam and obedience and love for Allah and His Messenger ﷺ, as well as striving in the cause of Allah and preserving the sacred boundaries of Islam. All of these are indicators of the excellence of their faith and among them are those whom the Prophet ﷺ appointed in positions of authority as he had done with ‘Attāb ibn Asīd when he made him in charge of Makkah on his behalf and he was among the best of the Muslims. He used to say: “O People of Makkah let it not reach me that any of you abandons his ṣalāh otherwise I will strike his neck.” The Prophet ﷺ appointed Abū Sufyān over the Najrān as a governor on his behalf. The Prophet ﷺ passed away and Abu Sufyān was governing Najrān on his behalf. Mu‘āwiyah’s Islam was considered superior to his father’s by consensus; just as his brother, Yazīd, was superior to him and his father.

He states further (4/457):

‘Umar رضي الله عنه used him as a governor after his brother Yazīd, and Mu‘āwiyah remained in his governorship throughout the khilāfah of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and

his people were appreciative of him and his good nature and conduct among them. They were loyal to him on account of them observing his forbearance and justice to the extent that none complained about him and none felt wronged by him. As for Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah, he was not of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ and he was only born in the time of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. He was named Yazīd after his uncle, the Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, Mu‘āwiyah, his brother Yazīd, Suhayl ibn ‘Amr and al-Ḥārith ibn Hishām and others among those who accepted Islam at the time of the Conquest witnessed the Battle of Ḥunayn with the Prophet ﷺ and they are included among those referred to in the verse of Qur’ān: “Then Allah sent down His tranquility upon His Messenger and upon the believers and sent down soldiers angels whom you did not see and punished those who

disbelieved. And that is the recompense of the disbelievers.”¹ So he was with the believers upon whom Allah sent down His tranquillity, with the Prophet ﷺ during the siege of al-Ṭā’if when they assaulted it with catapults.

He states further (4/466):

The Ṭulaqā were those who accepted Islam at the time of the Conquest like Mu‘āwiyah, his brother — Yazīd, ‘Ikrimah ibn Abī Jahl, Ṣafwān ibn Umayyah, al-Ḥārith ibn Hishām and Suhayl ibn ‘Amr. It has been established via mass transmission of the scholars that they remained upon Islam until their deaths. Mu‘āwiyah is more prominent in his Islam than others since he was in a position of governorship for over forty years; twenty years during the khilāfah of ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and a portion of ‘Alī, thereafter for a further twenty years as the khalīfah. He passed away in the year 60 A.H, 50 years after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ, Ḥasan handed over the khilāfah to him in the year 40 A.H, which was known as the year of unity.

He states further (35/64):

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 26

As for Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and his peers from the Ṭulaqā' of those who accepted Islam after the conquest, like 'Ikrimah ibn Abī Jahl, Ṣafwān ibn Umayyah, al-Ḥārith ibn Hishām, Suhayl ibn 'Amr and Abū Sufyān ibn al-Ḥārith, these and others who became good Muslims later on were never accused of hypocrisy after that, Mu'āwiyah was taken as a scribe by the Prophet ﷺ.

He states further (35/64):

Were it such that the likes of 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ and Mu'āwiyah were individuals whom it was feared that they were hypocrites, there would not have been placed in charge of the affairs of the Muslims. Actually, 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ is one of those whom the Prophet ﷺ appointed to a position of leadership in his lifetime. He appointed him as the leader of the army at the Battle of Dhāt al-Salāsil and the Prophet ﷺ would never appoint a hypocrite to lead the Muslim army. The Prophet ﷺ appointed Abū Sufyān over Najrān as a governor on his behalf. The Prophet ﷺ passed away and Abu Sufyān was governing Najrān on his behalf. Mu'āwiyah's Islam was considered superior to his father's by consensus; just as his brother Yazīd was superior to him and his father. How is it possible that these individuals be considered hypocrites whilst the Prophet ﷺ trusted them with the affairs of the Muslims? It is well-known what occurred with Mu'āwiyah and 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ in terms of the fitnah; yet none of those who sided with him, or opposed him, or were not involved at all ever accused him of lying against the Prophet ﷺ. On the contrary, all the scholars among the Ṣaḥābah, and those who came after them were unanimous that they were truthful in what they relay from the Prophet ﷺ, trustworthy in their narrations; and a hypocrite can never be trusted with transmitting from the Prophet ﷺ. Instead the hypocrite is one who lies against him, and disbelieves in him. And if they are believers who love Allah and His Messenger ﷺ; then whoever curses them has indeed disobeyed Allah and His Messenger ﷺ.

Chapter Four

The Virtues and Merits of Mu'āwiyah

There are many proofs that establish his virtue and merit, these proofs can be divided into two categories:

General Texts

These are the proofs that have established the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ in general; no doubt Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is included among them since there is nothing to warrant his exclusion from those merits.

Ibn Taymiyyah has written in his *Fatāwā* (4/459):

The greatest army to go out with the Prophet ﷺ was during the expedition of Tabūk, they were so large in number that it is difficult to count them. However no fighting occurred during this expedition. And those mentioned are included in the verse of the Qur'ān:

لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مِنَ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ
وَقَاتَلُوا ۚ وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَىٰ ۚ وَاللَّهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرٌ

Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought. But to all Allah has promised the best [reward]. And Allah , with what you do, is Acquainted.¹

Indeed those Ṭulaqā' from the Muslims who accepted Islam at the Conquest, they are the ones who spent [in the way of Allah] and fought. Indeed Allah has promised for them Paradise; as they fought and spent

1 Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 10

during the campaign of Ḥunayn and al-Ṭā'if. They are also included in the verse of the Qur'ān where Allah says:

وَالسَّابِقُونَ السَّابِقُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ۚ ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhajirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

Ibn al-Qayyim has stated in *al-Manār al-Munīf* (93):

Mu'āwiyah is included in that which is authentic regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and the virtues of Quraysh.

Specific Texts

There are numerous texts which indicate the virtue and merit of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. What follows are some of the textual evidences as well as statements from the early generation of Muslims.

Umayr ibn Sa'd said:

Do not mention Mu'āwiyah except in a good manner for indeed I heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying: "O Allah, make him a guide, rightly-guided and guide [others] through him."

This narration has been narrated by al-Bukhārī in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* (5/240), Aḥmad in his *Musnad* (17929), al-Tirmidhī in his *Jāmi'* (3843), Ibn Sa'd in *al-Ṭabaqāt*

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

(7/417), al-Ṭabarānī in *al-Awsaṭ* (656), and *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (2198), Ibn Abī ‘Āsim in *al-Āḥād wa al-Mathānī* (3129), Abū Nu‘aym in *al-Ḥilyah* (8/358), and *Akhbār Aṣḥihān* (1/180), al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharī‘ah* (1914,1915) and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in his *Tārīkh* (1/207).¹

Muslim narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (2604) from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه who reported:

I was playing with children when Allah’s Messenger ﷺ happened to pass by (us). I hid myself behind the door. He came and patted my shoulders and said: “Go and call Mu‘āwiyah. I returned and said: “He is busy in taking food.” He asked me to go again and call Mu‘āwiyah to him. I went (and came back) and said that he was busy in taking food, whereupon the Nabī ﷺ said: “May Allah not fill his belly!”

Ibn ‘Asākir has stated in his *Tārīkh* (59/106):

This is the most authentic of what has been narrated on the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Al-Nawawī has stated on his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (16/156):

Muslim has understood from this narration that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه did not deserve to be prayed against, so that is why he included it under this chapter; and others have taken it as a virtue of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه since it is – in reality – a supplication for him.²

Al-Dhahabī has stated in *Tadhkirat al-Huffāz* (2/699):

Perhaps this is a merit for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه since the Messenger ﷺ has also said: “O Allah, whoever I have cursed or spoken harshly to; make that

1 This is an authentic ḥadīth and the discussion on its authenticity has appeared earlier in this treatise.

2 See also *Usd al-Ghābah* (1027) by Ibn al-Athīr.

a means of purification and mercy for them.”

Ibn Kathīr, in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/402) has stated:

Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه has benefitted from that supplication in this world and the next.

Al-Bukhārī (2636) and Muslim (5925) narrate by way of Anas ibn Malik رضي الله عنه, from his maternal aunt, Umm Ḥarām bint Malḥān (rah) who said:

The Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم once slept in my house near to me and got up smiling. I said, “what makes you smile?” He replied, “some of my followers who were presented to me sailing on this green sea like kings on thrones.” I said, “O Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, ask Allah to make me one of them.” So the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم supplicated to Allah for her and went to sleep again. He did the same (i.e. got up and told his dream) and Umm Ḥarām repeated her question and he gave the same reply. She said, “supplicate to Allah to make me one of them.” He said, “you are among the first group.”

Later on it happened that she went out with her husband ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه [for jihād] and it was the first time the Muslims undertook a naval expedition, led by Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. When the expedition came to an end and they were returning to al-Shām, an animal was presented to her to ride, but the animal let her fall and thus she passed away.

Al-Bukhārī (2766) narrates by way of Thowr ibn Yazīd — from Khālīd ibn Ma‘dān that ‘Umayr ibn al-Aswad al-‘Ansī told him that he went to ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit while he was staying in his house at the coast of Ḥimṣ with [his wife] Umm Ḥarām. ‘Umayr said:

Umm Ḥarām informed us that she heard the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم saying, “the first army from my followers who will undertake a naval expedition have made [Paradise] compulsory [upon themselves].” Umm Ḥarām added, I said, “O Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, will I be amongst them?” He replied,

“you are amongst them.” The Prophet ﷺ then said, “the first army amongst my followers who will invade the city of Caesar will be forgiven.” I asked, “will I be one of them, O Messenger of Allah ﷺ?” He replied, “no.”

This narration contains within it a great merit and virtue for Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه since the first naval expedition that was undertaken by this ummah was under the command of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and the first to undertake a naval expedition was Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, during the reign of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.¹

Ibn Ḥajar says in *al-Fath* (6/120):

Al-Muhallab said: “In this ḥadīth there is a merit of Mu‘āwiyah since he was the first to undertake a naval expedition.”

He says further *al-Fath* (6/121):

The statement, “they have made it compulsory,” means they have done such an action, on account of which Paradise has been made compulsory for them.

Al-Munāwī says in *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* (3/83):

... meaning they have done such an action that made Paradise compulsory for them; or they have brought upon themselves forgiveness and mercy.

Abū Dāwūd (5229) narrates by way of Thowr — from Rāshid ibn Sa‘d — from Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه who said that he heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say:

If you search for the faults of the people, you will corrupt them, or will nearly corrupt them.

¹ See *al-Fath* (11/75)

Abū al-Dardā' said:

These are the words which Mu'āwiyah himself heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and Allah benefited him by them.

Ibn Kathīr mentions in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/417):

Meaning that he had an overall good reputation, pardoning nature, forgiving, very concealing [of others' flaws]; may Allah have mercy on him.

Among His Merits is That He Was a Scribe of the Prophet ﷺ

The narration appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (2501) from Ibn 'Abbās رضى الله عنه who reported:

The Muslims neither looked to Abū Sufyān (with respect) nor did they sit in his company. He, Abū Sufyān, said to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ: "O Messenger of Allah, grant me three things." He replied in the affirmative. He said: "I have with me the most beautiful and the best of the Arab (women) Umm Ḥabībah, daughter of Abu Sufyan, marry her; whereupon he said, "yes." He then said, "accept Mu'āwiyah to serve as your scribe." Nabī ﷺ said, "yes." He then said, "make me the commander (of the Muslim army) so that I should fight against the unbelievers as I fought against the Muslims," and once again the Nabī said, "yes."¹

Aḥmad has narrated in his *Musnad* (1/291) as well as Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī (2746) by way of Abū 'Awānah – who said – Abū Ḥamzah narrated to us that he heard Ibn 'Abbās رضى الله عنه saying:

1 There is a superficial problem in that the Prophet ﷺ married Umm Ḥabībah while she was in Abyssinia. A number of scholars have provided an explanation that removes any confusion. Among them: Ibn al-Qayyim in *Jalā' al-Afhām* (272), al-Nawawī in his commentary of *Muslim* (16/91) and Ibn Kathīr in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (4/146).

I was a young boy running around with the other children when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ happened to approach us from behind us, I assumed that he did not seek anyone but me so I ran and hid behind a door of a house and I did not realise until suddenly he embraced me. He patted me between my shoulders and said, “go and call Mu‘āwiyah for me,” and he [Mu‘āwiyah] was his [the Prophet ﷺ] scribe, so I ran and said: “respond to the call of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ as he needs you.”

The chain is fair¹, on account of Abū Ḥamzah al-Qaṣṣāb ‘Imrān ibn Abī ‘Aṭā’ al-Asadī, who is trustworthy, although he has a few oversights in his narrations. The essential part of this narration is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (2604), with the same wording except for the phrase, “he was his scribe,” by way of Shu‘bah, from Abū Ḥamzah, from Ibn ‘Abbās رضى الله عنه.

In *Musnad al-Bazzār* (2491) by way of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mālik al-Zubaydī — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr who said:

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent for Mu‘āwiyah and he was his scribe.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Mālik al-Zubaydī has been corroborated by Zuhayr ibn al-Aqmar as it appears in *al-Siyar* (3/123). Al-Imām Aḥmad said:

Mu‘āwiyah was the Prophet’s ﷺ scribe, his Companion, his brother-in-law, and one whom he trusted with revelation.²

Ibn Taymiyyah reproduced the statement of Ibn al-Muṭahhar in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/427):

They called him a scribe of Waḥī even though he did not write a word

1 Al-Dhahabī has authenticated this chain in *Tārīkh al-Islām* under the biography of Mu‘āwiyah (309).

2 See also *al-Sharīah* of al-Ājurri (5/2466), *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (2785) by al-Lālakā’ī, *Tārīkh Baghdād* (1/233) and *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/208).

of Waḥī ...” This is a statement devoid of any evidence. What is the proof that he did not write a single word of Waḥī, and that he only used to write letters.

He further states (4/442):

He was one of the scribes of revelation.

Ibn Kathīr states in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/397):

Mu‘āwiyah accompanied the Prophet ﷺ, and recorded the revelation in his presence along with the other scribes.

In *al-Sunnah* (2/434) al-Khallāl writes:

Aḥmad says regarding those who claim that they do not consider Mu‘āwiyah a scribe for the recording of Waḥī, and do not consider him to be the uncle of the believers, and that he usurped the position of leadership through the sword: “This is an evil statement. Such people are to be avoided, their company abandoned and their affair made clear to the people.”¹

Among His Merits is That He is the Uncle of the Believers²

Abū Ya‘lā states in *Tanzīh Khāl al-Mu‘minīn* (106):

The brothers of the wives of the Prophet ﷺ are referred to as the uncles of the believers. By that we do not mean biological relationship. What is meant is that they share the same status as an uncle in terms of reverence and respect.

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (3/434) with an authentic chain from Abū Bakr

1 This chain is authentic.

2 See *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (5/21), *Lum‘at al-I‘tiqād* (155), *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/369) and *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/396)

al-Marrūdhī who said that he heard Hārūn ibn ‘Abd Allāh saying to Abū ‘Abd Allāh (Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal) that a letter had come to him from Raqqah about a group of people who say that they do not consider Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه to be the uncle of the believers, so he became angry and said:

What do they object to about this? They [deserve] to be ostracized until they repent!

Aḥmad is quoted in *al-Sunnah* (2/433) when asked whether Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is the uncle of the believers; and Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه the uncle of the believers?

Yes, Mu‘āwiyah is the brother of Umm Ḥabībah bint Abī Sufyān, the wife of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم and their relative. Likewise Ibn ‘Umar is the brother of Ḥaḥṣah, the wife of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم and their relative.¹

Among his merits is that ‘Umar رضي الله عنه appointed him over al-Shām, and he remained in that position until ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه became the khalīfah, and he endorsed his nomination and kept him in his position for the duration of his khilāfah. It suffices that one appointed by ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and then ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to govern over al-Shām for a period that lasted twenty years and his performance of his duties with excellence, no incapacity, inaptitude or deceit was ever known from him.²

Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī states in *Taḥṣīr al-Janān* (20):

The agreement of both ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, and they are such noble personalities in terms of virtue, companionship of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم, and theirs is the highest example of piety, religiousness, fear of Allah, fine opinion, excellence in judgement of character, deep insight, that their appointment of Mu‘āwiyah over al-Shām is the greatest evidence of the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah and his deserving of that position.

1 The chain is authentic.

2 See *Tanzīh Khāl al-Mu‘minīn* (106)

What merit could possibly be beyond this? Add to that the fact that ‘Umar praised him and nominated him to govern in Damascus, al-Shām, until the end of his khilāfah; likewise the nomination of ‘Uthmān. It should suffice you to recognise the status of Mu‘āwiyah to know the extent to which ‘Umar I had given him governorship and that he recalled Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ who was far superior to Mu‘āwiyah; yet Mu‘āwiyah was given such a lengthy term in office without being dismissed. This ought to speak volumes for Mu‘āwiyah and his good governance that no complaints or shortfalls were perceived in his time as governor, as ‘Umar would never have appointed him if he lacked competence, or he would have dismissed him if he sensed the inability to lead. Many of the different communities complained of their governors to ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, and they were replaced — even though they held a lofty status. As for Mu‘āwiyah, he remained over the region of al-Shām for such a long period without complaints, nor accusation of injustice or transgression. Consider this so that your belief will increase and so that you will be safe from foolishness, stubbornness and false-accusation.

Al-Dhahabī said in his *Ṣiyar* (3/132):

It should suffice you that this is an individual who has been appointed by ‘Umar and then ‘Uthmān over a province — which is a frontier — and he excels in his duties and responsibilities, and his people are pleased with his generosity and forbearance even though some may have experienced some inconvenience at his hand on occasion; and likewise that he should continue as a king, even though there were others from the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ who excelled over him in virtue and piety. This is the man who ruled and led the world with his ingenious intellect, unsurpassed forbearance, bountiful generosity, subtle cunningness and tactful decisions. He also has those matters for which he will stand before Allah to account for. He was extremely beloved by his people; he was a governor over al-Shām for twenty years, then he became the khalīfah for twenty years. During this period no one dared to lampoon him in his kingdom, to the contrary all nations drew close to him and he ruled

over the Arabs and non-Arabs. His kingdom spanned over Arabia, Egypt, al-Shām, Iraq, Khūrasān [Central Asia], Persia, al-Jazīrah, Yemen and al-Maghrib [the Western Islamic regions] and other places as well.

Among His Merits is That He Was the Best of Monarchs

Ibn Taymiyyah says in his *Fatāwā* (4/478), “by consensus,” see also *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* (3/159). Ibn Abī al-‘Izz al-Ḥanafī states in his commentary of *al-Taḥāwīyyah* (2/302): “He was the best monarch of the Muslims.” See also *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/399) and *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* (2/15).

The Praise of the Earliest Muslims for Mu‘āwiyah

Al-Bukhārī narrates (3765) that a complaint came to Ibn ‘Abbās [about Mu‘āwiyah] praying one rak‘ah [unit of prayer] of witr [odd-numbered evening prayer] and he [Ibn ‘Abbās] said:

Indeed he is a jurist.

Al-Ṭabarānī narrates in *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (283), Abū Nu‘aym in *al-Ḥilyah* (8/275) by way of Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz — from Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd Allāh — from Qays ibn al-Ḥārith — from al-Ṣunābiḥī — from Abu al-Dardā’ who said:

I have not seen anyone whose prayer resembles the prayer of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ than your leader — meaning Mu‘āwiyah.

It was said to Qays, “how does his prayer compare to that of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and he responded, “I do not consider it except to resemble it closely”

The narrators are all reliable. Al-Haythamī said in *al-Majma’* (9/357):

Al-Ṭabarānī has narrated it, and its narrators are the narrators of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, save Qays ibn al-Ḥārith al-Madhḥajjī and he is reliable.

Al-Lālakā'ī narrates in *Sharh Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (2781), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/442), and Ibn 'Asākir (59/173) by way of Jabalah ibn Suḥaym who said:

I heard Ibn 'Umar saying: "I have not seen anyone after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ more tactful in leadership than Mu'āwiyah," it was said to him, "what about your father?" and he responded, "my father – may Allah have mercy on him – was superior to Mu'āwiyah. However, Mu'āwiyah was more tactful in leadership than him."

This has been corroborated by narrations from al-Khallāl (2/442-443), Ibn 'Asākir (59/174), *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of al-Bukhārī (7/327) abridged by way of Nāfi' — from Ibn 'Umar. See also *al-Siyar* (3/153). Therefore, it is fair.

Ma'mar has related in his *Jāmi'* (20985 from the printed *Muṣannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzāq), al-Khallāl (2/440), Ibn 'Asākir (59/175) from Wahb (and in some sources) Hammām ibn Munabbih, who heard Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه saying:

I have not seen any person who appeared to have been created for the role of kingship more than Mu'āwiyah. People would come to him from far and wide; and he was never miserly, stingy, harsh or temperamental.¹

Al-Balādhurī has also narrated it (5/54) in *Ansāb al-Ashraf* by way of Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥanafī, from a man, from Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه.

Ibn 'Asākir (59/211) as well as al-Ājurri, *al-Sharīah* (5/2466), narrate that a man from Marw [Merv] asked 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak whether Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was superior or 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz, so Ibn al-Mubārak responded:

The dust that entered the nostrils of Mu'āwiyah while with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is better than 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. Mu'āwiyah prayed behind the Prophet ﷺ who said, "may Allah hear [accept the prayer of] one who praises Him" and Mu'āwiyah said, "our Rabb, to you is all praise."

1 The chain is authentic.

Al-Ājurrī narrates in *al-Sharīḥ* (5/2466), al-Lālakāʾī in *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* (2785), Ibn ‘Asākir (59/209) as well Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in his *Tarīkh* (1/209) by way of Rabāh ibn al-Jarrāḥ al-Mowṣilī – who said – I heard a man asking al-Mu‘āfā ibn ‘Imrān how does ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz compare with Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and he became extremely angry and said:

None can be compared to the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم;
Mu‘āwiyah is his companion, his brother-in-law, his scribe and one
entrusted with the Waḥī from Allah.

Al-Ājurrī narrates in *al-Sharīḥ* (5/2465) and Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *Jamīʿ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Faḍlihi* (2/185) – with a similar narration – with an authentic chain from Abū Usāmah, Ḥammād ibn Usāmah that it was said to him, “who was better, ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz or Mu‘āwiyah?” so he responded:

None can be compared with the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم;
the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم said, “the best generation is my generation.”

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/434), with an authentic chain from Abū Bakr al-Marrūdhī who said that he asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh [Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal], ‘which of the two were superior: Mu‘āwiyah or ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz?’ and he responded:

We do not compare anyone with the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم. The Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم said, “the best generation is my generation, the one I have been sent amongst them.”¹

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/435), with an authentic chain from al-Mu‘āfā that he was asked whether Mu‘āwiyah was superior or ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. So he said:

Mu‘āwiyah was better than six hundred of the like of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

1 See also *al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl (2/434-435)

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/438), al-Ājurī in *al-Sharīh* (5/2465), and Ibn ‘Asākir (59/172) from Mujāhid who said:

Had you seen Mu‘āwiyah you would have said this is the Mahdī.

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/444), from al-Zuhrī, who said:

Mu‘āwiyah worked under ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb for many years without any detraction.¹

Al-Lālakā’ī narrates in *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (8/1532), al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (2/432), from ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Maymūnī:

I asked Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, “did the Prophet ﷺ not say, ‘every relation of lineage and marriage shall end except mine?’” he said, “certainly.” I asked, “does this apply to Mu‘āwiyah?” He said, “yes, he has a relation through marriage and blood.” He said, “I heard Aḥmad saying what is with them and Mu‘āwiyah, we ask Allah for safety.”

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/438) by way of Abū Bakr ibn ‘Ayyāsh, from Abū Ishāq:

I have not seen anyone like him after him – referring to Mu‘āwiyah.²

Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī said that Yazīd ibn Ṭahmān al-Raqqāshī narrated to us – who said – Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn said:

Mu‘āwiyah, if he narrated from the Prophet ﷺ anything would not be suspected [of misrepresentation].

Abū Dāwūd also mentions this in his *Sunan* (4123). See also *Tārīkh Dimashq* (59/167)

1 This chain is authentic.

2 This chain is authentic.

and *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/437).

How beautiful is what al-Khaṭīb narrates in *Tārīkh Baghdād* (1/208) and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārīkh Dimashq* (58/168) by of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī — from ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubayr — from Miswar ibn Makhramah that he once went to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and said:

When I entered upon him — the narrator says I think he said I made salām — he asked me, “what has come of your accusing the leaders, O Miswar?” I said, let us leave that aside; or let us discuss what I have come here for.” He said, “you shall speak what is on your chest.” Miswar said, “I did not leave anything with which I could fault him except that I told him about it.” Then he said, “I do not absolve myself from sins. Do you have sins that you fear destruction for yourself if Allah does not forgive you?” I said, “yes.” He said, “what makes you more deserving of hope in Allah’s forgiveness than me? I swear by Allah, that which I take responsibility for with regards to resolving peoples disputes, upholding the penalties, engaging in jihād in the path of Allah, and the great matters which you cannot count, is much more than what you have taken up on yourself. And I am upon a religion in which Allah accepts the good deeds and pardons the errors. And I swear by Allah, that whenever presented with a choice between Allah and others besides him I have always chosen Allah over anyone besides Him!” Miswar said, “I reflected upon what he said and realised that he had proven his point to me in this discussion.” ‘Urwah says, “I did not hear Miswar after remembering Mu‘āwiyah except that he would pray for him.”

‘Abd al-Razzāq narrates it in his *Muṣannaf* (7/207) from Ma‘mar — from al-Zuhrī — from Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān — from al-Miswar — this chain is authentic.

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr states in *al-Istī‘āb* (671):

This narration is from the most authentic of what is narrated from Ibn Shihāb. Ma‘mar narrates it from him along with a group of those who narrate from him.

Shu‘ayb also narrates a similar narration from Ibn al-Zuhrī — from Urwah — from al-Miswar.¹

Al-Balādhurī narrates in *Ansāb al-Ashraf* (5/53) by way of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Ja‘far — from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Miswar ibn Makhramah — from his father.² He narrates it at another place in his book (5/42) with a different chain.

Abū Zur‘ah narrates in his *Tārīkh* (1/189) with his chain to al-Awzā‘ī – who said:

A number of companions witnessed the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah; among them Usāmah, Sa’d, Jābir, ibn ‘Umar, Zayd ibn Thābit, Maslamah ibn Makhlad, Abū Sa‘īd, Rāfi‘ ibn Khadīj, Abū Umāmah, Anas ibn Mālik, and many others whose numbers are greater than double of what we have mentioned. They were lanterns of guidance, and vessels of knowledge. They witnessed the revelation of the Book, and took its interpretation and explanation from the Messenger ﷺ. There were also those from the generation of the Tābi‘īn [who followed them in excellence], the likes of Miswar ibn Makhramah, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Aswad ibn ‘Abd Yaghūth, Sa‘īd ibn al-Mūsāyyib, ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubayr, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥayrīz among many others who did not desist from maintaining the unity of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ.

Statements of the Earliest Muslims Regarding Those Who Revile Mu‘āwiyah

The earlier Muslims were very harsh in their condemnation of anyone who cursed Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, to the extent of excommunicating such people and avoiding their company, as well as not praying behind such people and making an example out of them. These are some of the texts bearing their statements in this regard.

Al-Ājurri in *al-Sharī‘ah* (5/2468), Ibn ‘Asākir in his *Tārīkh* (59/206) narrate by way

1 See *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/385)

2 In the published version it appears as ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd — from Ja‘far and this is an error.

of Qatādah — from Ḥasan when some people had testified that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his companions are in the Fire, He said:

May Allah curse them, what gives them the idea that he is in the Fire?

Ibn ‘Asākir (59/206) narrates by way of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik in Abī al-Shawārib – who said – Bishr ibn al-Faḍl narrated to us — from Abu al-Ashhab who said that it was said to Ḥasan that some people curse Mu‘āwiyah and Ibn al-Zubayr. He responded:

May the curse of Allah be upon those who are swearing and cursing them!

Abū Towbah al-Ḥalabi, al-Rabī‘ ibn Nāfi‘ said:

Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān is the veil covering the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلی الله علیه وسلم. So, any man who lifts this veil will be bold [to attack] that which is behind the veil.¹

Wakī‘ ibn Jarrāḥ said:

Mu‘āwiyah is like the door knocker, whoever moves it we accuse him of what lays beyond [i.e. the rest of the Ṣaḥābah].²

Likewise, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak said:

Mu‘āwiyah, according to us, is a test. Whoever looks at him strangely, we accuse them of the entire community. I mean by that the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger صلی الله علیه وسلم.³

Ibn ‘Asākir narrates in *Tārikh Dimashq* (59/211) with his chain to Ibrāhīm ibn

1 Narrated by al-Khatīb in his *Tārikh* (1/209), and Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārikh Dimashq* (59/209), see also *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr (11/450)

2 Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārikh Dimashq* (59/210)

3 Ibn ‘Asākir in *Tārikh Dimashq* (59/211)

Maysarah who said:

I have not seen ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz lash anyone except a person who swore Mu‘āwiyah. He would lash him.

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/447) with his chain to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal that he was asked, “can we write [ḥadīth] from a person who said that Mu‘āwiyah died upon something other than Islam; or that he was a disbeliever?” he replied, “No...” then he said, “none of the companions of the Prophet ﷺ shall be declared a disbeliever.”

Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ mentions in *al-Shifā* (2/267):

Mālik said, “whoever curses the Prophet ﷺ should be killed; and whoever curses any of his companions ought to be disciplined.” He also said: “Whoever curses any of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ; if it is said they were upon misguidance or disbelief such a person should be killed; and if they curse them on reasons other than this they should be dealt with in the most severe manner.”

Al-Khallāl relates in *al-Sunnah* (2/434):

Aḥmad says regarding those who claim that they do not consider Mu‘āwiyah a scribe for the recording of Waḥī, and do not consider him to be the uncle of the believers, and that he usurped the position of leadership through the sword: “This is an evil statement. Such people are to be avoided, their company abandoned and their affair made clear to the people.”¹

Al-Khallāl relates further in *al-Sunnah* (2/448):

Muḥammad ibn Mūsā narrated to me saying that he heard Abū Bakr ibn

1 This chain is authentic.

Sindī — a relative of Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī — saying that he heard [or was present] when a man asked Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, “O Abū ‘Abd Allāh, I have an uncle who has mentioned that he ridicules Mu‘āwiyah. Sometimes I dine with him.” Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal immediately said, “do not eat with him.”¹

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/432) from ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Maymūnī who said:

I asked Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, “did the Prophet ﷺ not say, ‘every relation of lineage and marriage shall end except mine?’” he said, “Certainly.” I said, “[Does] this apply to Mu‘āwiyah?” He said, “Yes, he has a relation through marriage and blood.” He said: “I heard Aḥmad saying what is with them and Mu‘āwiyah, we ask Allah for safety.”

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/447), and Ibn ‘Asākir (59/210) with the chain to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal who was asked if a person ridicules Mu‘āwiyah or ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ will such a person be referred to as a Rāfiḍī? He replied:

None has the audacity to say anything about them except that he harbours evil. No one ridicules any of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ except that he has evil residing within him. The Prophet ﷺ said: “The best of generations is my generation.”²

In the *Masā’il* of Ibn Hānī’ al-Naysapūrī (1/60) he said that he heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh being asked about a person who curses Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, shall people pray behind such a person. He responded:

No! Such a person does not deserve to be prayed behind and no dignity is lost in doing so.³

1 This chain is sound.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/450)

3 See *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* (1/285)

In the *Su'ālāt* of al-Ājurī (2/51) he says:

I heard Abū Dāwūd saying, “Bishr ibn al-Ḥārith [the famous ascetic known as Bishr al-Ḥāfi] would not speak to Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb on account of him having said something [negative] about Mu'āwiyah.”

Al-Khallāl writes in *al-Sunnah* (2/448) that Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was asked about a person who swears Mu'āwiyah whether such a person may be the *Sulṭān* [Muslim leader]. He said:

It is more deserving that it is passed on to someone else.

Ibn Taymiyyah writes in *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* (35/58) in response to a question regarding someone who curses Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه what ought to be done to such a person? He responded:

All praise belongs to Allah. Whoever curses any of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم like Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, or 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ and the likes of them, or those who are more virtuous in rank like Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī or Abū Hurayrah and the likes of them; or those who are yet superior to them in rank like Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, or Abū Bakr or 'Umar, or 'Ā'ishah [the mother of the believers], or others besides them from the Ṣaḥābah, then such a person is deserving of some kind of retribution or punishment according to the unanimous view of the scholars of the religion. The scholars only disputed over whether such a person ought to be punished by death or what is less than death.¹

1 See also *al-Istī'āb* (450) and *Tārīkh Dimashq* (16/213)

Chapter Five

The Consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah on Remaining Silent on What Occurred Between the Ṣaḥābah¹

The earliest Muslims used to prohibit the reading of the incidents and historical accounts which cast aspersions on any of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ.

Al-Khallāl has stated in *al-Sunnah* (2/464):

‘Iṣmah ibn ‘Iṣām had related to me that Ḥanbal had said: “I intended to compile a book on Ṣiffīn and Jamal, from Khalaf ibn Sālim², so I went to Abū ‘Abd Allāh [Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal] to ask him about it and he said, ‘what will you do with that as there is no discussion on ḥalāl and ḥarām in that? I had written [recorded] what Khalaf had written, I recorded the chains and avoided the discussions whereas Khalaf had done so. We were both present with Ghundar³ and we recorded narrations from him. I wrote the chains of transmission of the narrations of Shu‘bah, whereas Khalaf had recorded everything.’ I asked him, ‘why did you write the chains of transmission but not the texts?’ He said, ‘I wanted to know what Shu‘bah narrates from that.’ Ḥanbal said, ‘I went to Khalaf and wrote down those narrations, and Abū

1 Al-Mālikī states:

Discussing what happened between the Ṣaḥābah if it is based on knowledge and done sincerely and with the objective of arriving at the truth then there is nothing wrong in doing so. On the contrary it becomes an obligatory duty that is discharged if a few of the learned perform the task. However, it is not permitted to leave it out [speaking about what happened among the Ṣaḥābah].

Through this statement of his he has undermined the consensus of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, and their agreement on avoiding discussions on the topic of what occurred between the Ṣaḥābah. See what he has written in *al-Ṣuḥbah wa al-Ṣaḥābah* (224)

2 He is Khalaf ibn Sālim al-Makhramī, a reliable narrator.

3 He is Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Hudhalī, A great scholar and memoriser of ḥadīth.

‘Abd Allāh came to know of this so he told my father to take what I had written and lock it away and not allow me to read it.’”¹

Ibn Baṭṭah writes in *al-Ibānah* (294):

Do not look in the book of Ṣifḥīn, Jamāl, the incident at the home of ‘Uthmān, and all the other disputes that occurred among them. Do not write it for yourself or for anyone else. Do not narrate it from anyone and do not narrate it to anyone, nor should you hear it from someone who narrates it from someone else. Upon this the noble scholars of this ummah are unanimous — the prohibition of doing what we described earlier — and among those who expressed this are Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Yūnus ibn ‘Ubayd, Sufyān al-Thowrī, Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Idrīs, Mālik ibn Anas, Ibn Abī Dhīb, Ibn al-Munkadir, Ibn al-Mubārak, Shu‘ayb ibn Ḥarb, Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī, Yūsuf ibn Asbāṭ, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Bishr ibn al-Ḥārith, ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Warrāq. All of them held the opinion of prohibition of looking into, reading, narrating or listening to what transpired between them and they cautioned their students from making effort to collect these reports. And those among them who had done this have narrated of them [the teachers] many things, with various expressions, all of which prohibit and caution against those who narrate such reports or listen to them.

Al-Dhahabī states in *al-Siyar* (10/92):

As it has been established that one should avoid what happened between the Ṣaḥābah and their fighting — may Allah be pleased with them all — we still find many collections, books, treatises etc., passing us. However, most of it is interrupted [in terms of its chain] and weak.

They considered the narrations which describe what happened between the Ṣaḥābah to be of three kinds:

1. That which is an outright fabrication.

1 The chain is authentic.

2. That which has been manipulated through omission or addition.
3. That which is correctly transmitted of which they are excused either on account of correct *ijtihād* or *ijtihād* in which they erred.

However, they have preceding virtues and merits and righteous characteristics and deeds which warrant their pardon for what transpired between them and Allah had praised them with full knowledge of what would later transpire.

Ibn Baṭṭah narrates with an authentic chain [as assessed by Ibn Taymiyyah in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (2/22)] — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad — from his father — who said — Abū Mu‘āwiyah narrated to us — saying that — Rajā’ narrated to us — from Mujāhid — from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه who said:

Do not abuse the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صلی الله علیه وسلم since Allah has instructed that you seek forgiveness for them and He knew that they would dispute and fight.¹

The scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah have consensus on the fact that one should not delve into that which occurred between the Ṣaḥābah, and rather avoid it.

Al-Khaṭṭābī narrates in *al-‘Uzlah* (44) by way of Ḥamzah ibn al-Ḥārith al-Dahhān — who said — ‘Abd Allāh ibn Rowḥ al-Madā’inī narrated to us — who said — Yaḥyā ibn al-Ṣāmit narrated to us — who said — Abū Ishāq al-Fazārī narrated to us — from al-A‘mash — from Abū Rāshid — who said — a man from Baṣrah came to ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar saying:

Indeed the messenger of your brothers in Baṣrah have sent me to you, conveying their greetings and asking about the matter between these two men, ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān and what do you have to say about them? ‘Ubayd Allāh asked, “is there anything else?” when the response came in the negative, he said, “prepare provisions for the man — and once that was

1 *Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah* (2/1152) — there is an error in the published version, instead of Abū Mu‘āwiyah it reads [Mu‘āwiyah].

complete he said — convey to them my greetings and inform them that I have this to say to them:

تِلْكَ أُمَّةٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ ۖ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَلَكُمْ مَا كَسَبْتُمْ ۖ وَلَا تُسْأَلُونَ عَمَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

That was a nation which has passed on. It will have [the consequence of] what it earned and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.¹

Al-Khaṭṭābī narrates in *al-ʿUzlah* (44), as well as Abū Nuʿaym in *al-Ḥilyah* (9/144) by way of Yūnus ibn al-Aʿlā — from al-Shāfiʿī — who said — it was said to ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz: “What do you say regarding the people of Ṣiffīn?” He replied:

That is blood which Allah has kept my hands pure from; I do not wish to dye my tongue with that.²

A similar statement is recorded by Ibn Saʿd in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (5/394) and Ibn ʿAsākir (65/133) by way of Khālīd ibn Yazīd ibn Bishr — from his father who said that ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was asked regarding ʿAlī, ʿUthmān, al-Jamal and Ṣiffīn and his response was:

That is blood which Allah avoided by hand from, I do not wish to soil my tongue with it.³

Al-Khallāl narrates in *al-Sunnah* (2/460) and Ibn al-Jowzī in *al-Manāqib* (164):

It was said to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, “what do you say about what happened between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah?” He responded, “I only speak of them that which is the best; may Allah have mercy on them all.”⁴

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 134

2 This chain is interrupted.

3 Al-Khallāl narrates it in *al-Sunnah* (1/261) via an alternate chain. All these variant chains support each other and elevate the report to an acceptable level.

4 The chain is authentic.

Under the biography of Ḥasan ibn Ismāʿīl al-Rabāʿī in *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* (1/349) Imām Aḥmad is quoted saying:

Ninety men from the generation of the Tābiʿīn and the scholars of the Muslims and the jurists of the Muslim territories are unanimous in their view of abstaining from whatever transpired between the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ, as well as the view that the best of people of the Prophet ﷺ are Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, ʿAlī — the cousin of the Prophet ﷺ, as well as seeking mercy for all the Ṣaḥābah as well as the wives of the Prophet ﷺ and his extended family. May the Pleasure of Allah be upon all of them. This is the Sunnah so hold on to it. Holding fast to it is guidance and abandoning it is misguidance.

Al-Khaṭīb narrates in his *Tārīkh* (7/44) as well as Ibn ʿAsākir (59/141) as well as Abū Yaʿlā in his *Ṭabaqāt* (1/251) with their chains to Imām Aḥmad that a person asked him about what happened between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah so he turned away from the man. It was said, “O Abū ʿAbd Allāh this is a man from Banū Hāshim, so he turned to the man and said:

تِلْكَ أُمَّةٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ ۖ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَلَكُمْ مَا كَسَبْتُمْ ۖ وَلَا تُسْأَلُونَ عَمَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

That was a nation which has passed on. It will have [the consequence of] what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.¹

Ibn Kathir states in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (11/427):

This was the view of many of the earliest Muslims.

Ibn ʿAdī narrates in *al-Kāmil* (4/34) and through his chain Ibn ʿAsākir (22/215) from Shihāb ibn Khirāsh ibn Ḥowshab, the nephew of al-ʿAwwām ibn Ḥowshab, who said:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah:134

I witnessed those whom I witnessed of the earliest of the ummah and they all say: “Mention the good of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ and that which unites the hearts. Do not mention what occurred between them as this will disunite the people.”

There are alternative chains for this report, like that narrated by al-Khallāl in *al-Sunnah* (513).

Al-Lālakāʾī narrates in *Uṣūl Iʿtiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* (321) with his chain to Ibn Abī Ḥātim who said:

I asked my father as well as Abū Zurʿah about the view of Ahl al-Sunnah regarding matters of the essentials of faith, and that which they found the scholars of the various regions upon in terms of what their beliefs were, whether it was Ḥijāz, al-Shām, Iraq or Yemen. They replied that their beliefs were as follows: “Imān [faith] comprises speech and action, it increases and decreases, the Qurʾān is the Speech of Allah, not created in all its aspects. Predestination, the good and bad of it is all from Allah. The best of this ummah after its Prophet ﷺ is Abū Bakr, then ʿUmar, then ʿUthmān, then ʿAlī and they are the rightly guided Khulafāʾ; and that the ten whom the Prophet named and testified that they shall enter Paradise are as he has spoken of them and that his speech is the truth and that one should seek mercy for all the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ﷺ and avoid discussion what transpired between them...”

Aḥmad narrates in *Fadāʾil al-Ṣaḥābah* (1739) with his chain to Maymūn ibn Mihrān — who said:

Three things I reject: cursing the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ﷺ, looking into the stars [astrology], and looking into matters of predestination [al-Qadr].¹

1 This chain is authentic.

Ibn ‘Asākir has mentioned under the biography of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (59/141) with his chain to Abū Zur‘ah al-Razī who said:

A person came to my uncle and said, “I hate Mu‘āwiyah.” So my uncle asked him why and he responded, “it is because he fought ‘Alī without a rightful course.” So Abū Zur‘ah remarked: “The Rabb of Mu‘āwiyah is a Merciful Rabb, and the opposition of Mu‘āwiyah is a noble opposition. What gives you the right to interfere?”

Al-Khallāl narrates — with a sound chain to Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal — in *al-Sunnah* (512):

It was said to Aḥmad, “what do you say about one who considers it permitted to speak about the pitfalls of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ?” He replied, “this is evil speech, such people should be avoided, the company abandoned and people ought to be made aware of their harm.”

Al-Ṣābūnī writes in *‘Aqīdat al-Salaf wa Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth* (294):

They held the view of refraining from discussing what transpired between the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and to purify ones tongue from mentioning what could be understood to be a flaw or belittling towards them.

Abū Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī write in *al-İbānah* (78):

As for what transpired between ‘Alī and Zubayr and ‘Ā’ishah then it only happened on account of applying their discretion and ijtihād. ‘Alī and the others were qualified for ijtihād, and the Prophet ﷺ had testified that they all were from the people of Jannah which indicates that their ijtihād was a rightful ijtihād. Likewise what transpired between ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah occurred on account of differing ijtihād. All the Ṣaḥābah are trustworthy leaders and none suspects them an anything regarding their

religion. Allah and His Messenger ﷺ have praised all of them, and we gain proximity to Allah through respecting and revering them, and associating ourselves with them and disassociating ourselves from those who belittle any one of them.

Ibn Abī Zayd states in his book on belief (23):

... and none of the Ṣaḥābah should be mentioned except with the best mention; and to refrain from discussing the internal conflicts among them; and they are the most deserving of excuses for their actions, and that they should be given the best thoughts.

Al-Khaṭṭābī says in *al-Ghunya* (59):

They held the view of refraining from discussing what transpired between the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and to purify ones tongue from mentioning what could be understood to be a flaw or belittling towards them.

Ibn Baṭṭāh writes in *al-Ibānah* (294):

After that we refrain from mentioning what transpired between the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ as they witnessed the battles with him, and they preceded the rest of people with virtues. Allah has forgiven them and instructed you to seek forgiveness for them and to gain proximity to him through loving them; and enjoined that upon us from the tongue of His Prophet ﷺ and He knew what would happen between them and that they would fight...

Al-Qurṭubī writes in his *Tafsīr* (16/3216):

It is not permitted to ascribe to any of them an absolute error since they were all mujtahids in what they had done and they sought the pleasure of Allah in all they did. All of them are our leaders and guides and we seek

closeness to Allah through refraining from discussion of what transpired among them. We shall not mention them except in the best manner because we hold sacred the status of companionship and because the Prophet ﷺ prohibited from cursing them, and Allah has forgiven them and expressed His Pleasure with them.

Al-Ājurrī writes in *al-Sharīḥ* (5/2458-2491) in refutation of those who permit discussing what transpired between the Ṣaḥābah:

It is necessary for one who reflects on what we have written regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the virtues of his noble household — may Allah be pleased with all of them — that he loves them and seeks mercy and forgiveness for them and to pray for them and to mention them with mercy and request Allah’s divine happiness for them and that he thanks Allah he grants him the ability to do this; and not to mention that which transpired between them and not to harp on it and to delve deep into it. If a beguiled fool contradicts us then he has stepped away from the path of guidance by doing this, and by saying: why did so-and-so fight so-and-so and why did he fight and why did he? It should be said to such a person: you and I have no need to mention this as it holds no benefit, nor harm, to any one of us to know that.

If someone says, “why not?,” then it should be said to him: It is because these are trials witnessed by the Ṣaḥābah and they reacted in accordance with their knowledge and better judgement and they were more knowledgeable in how to interpret the situation and they were on better guidance than those who came after them since they are the people of Paradise. Upon them was the Qur’ān revealed, and they witnessed the era of the Prophet ﷺ and they fought alongside him and Allah has testified to the fact that He is Pleased with them and that they have achieved forgiveness and a great reward; and the Prophet ﷺ testified that they were the best of all generations. They were more knowledgeable of Allah and His Messenger ﷺ; and of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. From them knowledge is taken, and it is in accordance with their statements do we live, and with their

rulings do we judge, and with their manners do be behave, and it is they whom we follow and it is this that we have been instructed with.

If someone then says, “what harm is there in knowing what happened between them and investigating it?,” it ought to be said to such a person: there is no doubt that their minds are greater than ours, and ours is much more deficient and we have no assurance that if we research what happened between them that we will not stray from the path of truth, and go against what we have been instructed to with regards to them.

And if someone says, “what have we been instructed with regarding them?” it will be said: we have been instructed with seeking forgiveness for them, asking for Allah’s Mercy to descend upon them, to love and follow them. The Qur’ān and Sunnah teach this, as well as the scholars of the Muslims. We have no need to mention what happened between them. Allah has guaranteed for them in His Book that he will not humiliate any of them, and He has mentioned in His Book that He has given their description in the Torah and the Injīl and He described them with the most beautiful of descriptions and the best of qualities, and He has told us that He has forgiven them all; and if He pardons them He shall not punish any one of them ever; and that they are pleased with Him.

لَا تَجِدُ قَوْمًا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ يُوَادُّونَ مَنْ حَادَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ وَلَوْ كَانُوا آبَاءَهُمْ أَوْ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ
أَوْ إِخْوَانَهُمْ أَوْ عَشِيرَتَهُمْ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ كَتَبَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمُ الْإِيمَانَ وَأَيَّدَهُم بِرُوحٍ مِّنْهُ ۖ وَيُدْخِلُهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ
تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا ۚ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ حِزْبُ اللَّهِ ۚ أَلَا
إِنَّ حِزْبَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

You will not find a people who believe in Allah and the Last Day having affection for those who oppose Allah and His Messenger, even if they were their fathers or their sons or their brothers or their kindred. Those - He has decreed within their hearts faith and supported them with spirit from Him. And We will admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they abide eternally. Allah is pleased with them, and they are

pleased with Him - those are the party of Allah . Unquestionably, the party of Allah - they are the successful.¹

If it is said, “my reason for wanting to know this is so that I have knowledge regarding it, and none of their affair will be absent from me, I love to know everything about them and not to be ignorant.” It will be said to such a person: you are one who seeks trouble since you are searching for that which holds harm for you and will not benefit you. If you engaged yourself in correcting that which is Allah’s right over you in what he made an obligation upon you in terms of fulfilling the obligatory duties and abstaining from the prohibitions, that would be better for you — more so in the times in which we live in terms of the evils that have become apparent in terms of deviant ideologies [what would he say if he witnessed the times we live in] — it will also be said to him: your preoccupation with your food and clothing is where? That is deserving of more importance. Likewise your financial matters, how you earn and spend your wealth deserves more attention. Also, we do not wish that on account of your seeking these matters that your heart becomes deviated and develops desires that you ought not to follow, and the devils will begin playing with your mind so you then begin to curse and hate those whom Allah has instructed you to love and to seek forgiveness for and follow. So your foot might slip from the straight path and you will tread the path of falsehood.

If it is said, “so mention for us from the Qur’ān and Sunnah, and from those who have come to pass from the great scholars from the Muslims that which proves what you have said so that we can return our hearts from its deviation and its quest to find out what transpired between the Ṣaḥābah,” it will be said to him: we have previously mentioned that which you have asked for wherein there is a proof and conveying of the true message to people of intelligence. However, we shall repeat some of what had been mentioned previously so that the discerning believer might be alerted to the path of truth, Allah says:

1 Sūrah al-Mujādalah: 22

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ۚ ذَٰلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ ۖ وَمَثَلُهُمْ
فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيْعِيظَ بِهِمُ
الْكُفَّارَ

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah ; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Injil is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers - so that Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers.¹

Thereafter He promises them forgiveness and a great reward:

وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْهُمْ مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا عَظِيمًا

Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.²

لَقَدْ تَابَ اللَّهُ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ وَالْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ الَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُ فِي سَاعَةِ الْعُسْرَةِ مِن بَعْدِ مَا كَادَ يَزِيغُ
قُلُوبَ فَرِيقٍ مِّنْهُمْ ثُمَّ تَابَ عَلَيْهِمْ ۚ إِنَّهُ بِهِمْ رَءُوفٌ رَّحِيمٌ

Allah has already forgiven the Prophet and the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār who followed him in the hour of difficulty after the hearts of a party of them had almost inclined [to doubt], and then He forgave them. Indeed, He was to them Kind and Merciful.³

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29

2 ibid

3 Sūrah al-Towbah: 117

وَالسَّابِقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ۚ ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِي اللَّهُ النَّبِيَّ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَعَهُ ۖ نُورُهُمْ يَسْعَىٰ بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَبِأَيْمَانِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا أَتْمِمْ لَنَا نُورَنَا وَاغْفِرْ لَنَا ۖ إِنَّكَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

On the Day when Allah will not disgrace the Prophet and those who believed with him. Their light will proceed before them and on their right; they will say, “Our Rabb, perfect for us our light and forgive us. Indeed, You are over all things competent.”²

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ ۗ وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ ۚ مِنْهُمْ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَأَكْثُرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoy what is right and forbid what is wrong and believe in Allah . If only the People of the Scripture had believed, it would have been better for them. Among them are believers, but most of them are defiantly disobedient.³

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

2 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 8

3 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muhammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest.¹

وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

And those who came after them, saying, “Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Rabb, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.”²

The Prophet ﷺ said:

The best of people are my generation, then those who come after them, then those who come after them.

Ibn Mas'ūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said:

Indeed Allah looked at the hearts of the creation and found the heart of Muḥammad ﷺ the best of the hearts of the creation, so He chose him for Himself and sent him with His message. Thereafter, he looked at the hearts of the creation, after the heart of Muḥammad ﷺ, and found the hearts of his Ṣaḥābah the best of the hearts of all creation — besides the other Prophets and Messengers — so he made them the advisers of His Prophet ﷺ, they will fight for His religion.³

Thereafter al-Ājurī says:

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 18

2 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 10

3 This narration has also been narrated by Abū Nu'aym in *al-Imāmah* (202), and al-Ājurī (1128) and its chain is authentic.

It will be said to one who heard this from Allah and His Messenger ﷺ: if you are a slave who has been granted inclination towards good, you would heed the admonition of Allah and adhere to what he commands you with; and if you are one who follows his own desires I fear that you be from those whom Allah describes as:

وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّنِ اتَّبَعَ هَوَاهُ بِغَيْرِ هُدًى مِّنَ اللَّهِ

And who is more astray than one who follows his desire without guidance from Allah?¹

وَلَوْ عَلِمَ اللَّهُ فِيهِمْ خَيْرًا لَّأَسْمَعَهُمْ ۖ وَلَوْ أَسْمَعَهُمْ لَتَوَلَّوْا وَهُمْ مُّعْرِضُونَ

Had Allah known any good in them, He would have made them hear. And if He had made them hear, they would [still] have turned away, while they were refusing.²

It will be said to him: whoever comes to the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ to find fault in them, to blame some, to censure some, to praise some, and ridicule others; such a person is one seeking trouble and internal conflict. And it is in fitnah that he has fallen since his duty was to love them all and seek forgiveness for them.

Abu al-Qāsim Ismāʿīl al-Iṣfahānī (d.530 A.H) has written in *al-Ḥujjah fī Bayān al-Maḥajjah* (1/252):

It is from the Sunnah to remain silent on what occurred between the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and to promote their virtues, and to follow them as they are the shining stars.

Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī says in *Lumʿat al-Iʿtiqād* (150):

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 50

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 23

It is from the Sunnah to associate with the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ and to love them, and mention their good qualities, and to seek mercy and forgiveness for them; and to refrain from mentioning their pitfalls and whatever transpired between them, and to believe in their virtue and to acknowledge their services at the beginning of Islam. Allah says:

وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

And those who came after them, saying, “our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Rabb, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.”¹

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَى عَلَى سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيُغَيِّظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah ; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers - so that Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers.²

The Prophet ﷺ said:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 10

2 Sūrah al-Fath: 29

Do not curse my Ṣaḥābah, for indeed if one of you had to spend the equivalent of Uḥud in gold, it would not reach the mudd¹ of one of them or even half of that.

Al-Nawawī said in his commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (18/219-220):

It is the stance of Ahl al-Sunnah is to hold the best opinion of them and to refrain from discussing the internal conflict, and to apply a plausible interpretation to the fighting that occurred. They exercised ijtihād and did not intend disobedience, nor the affairs of the world. Rather every group considered itself to be on the truth, and that its opposition was exceeding the bounds; therefore it was necessary to fight them to return them to the command of Allah. Some of them applied ijtihād and were correct and others erred in their ijtihād and they can be excused for their error. If the Mujtahid errs there is no blame on him.

Ibn Taymiyyah says in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (4/448):

The stance of Ahl al-Sunnah is to associate with the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ and to love them, and mention their good qualities, and to seek mercy and forgiveness for them; and to refrain from mentioning their pitfalls and whatever transpired between them. As for what transpired between them, for some of it they have a valid excuse, some of which they repented from, and some of which they are pardoned for. As for delving in their internal disputes in creates an attitude of hatred an animosity towards them in the hearts of many; and in so doing this person errs and becomes one who disobeys. They begin to find fault with those who do not deserve fault, and certain matters are praised even though they do not warrant praise. Therefore, the attitude of silence was the way of the virtuous among the first Muslims.

He says in *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwa* (3/406):

1 A unit of measurement equivalent to approximately 750 ml.

Likewise we believe in refraining from discussion of what occurred between them and we know that some of what has been transmitted in that regard is false. They were people who exercised *ijtihād*, so they either arrived at the correct result and are rewarded a double-reward, or rewarded for their *ijtihād* even though it was not the correct result, and they are pardoned for this. As for their misdeeds, they already have the promise of Allah that they will be granted Paradise, so Allah shall definitely pardon them either through their repentance or through righteous deeds that erase sins, or through afflictions that expiate sins, or some other means. Indeed they are the best generation of this ummah.

Al-Dhahabī said in his *al-Siyar* (3/128):

So we praise Allah for our well-being that He brought us into existence in a time when the truth has become clear and unambiguous from both sides. We know where both sides are taking their opinion from; and we have become well-informed and aware and we have excused and sought forgiveness for and love within moderation. We have asked for mercy for the rebellious party by a broad interpretation in general; or on account of error — with Allah’s permission — which may be forgiven. And we say, as Allah has taught us, “O our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who have preceded us in faith; and place not in our hearts enmity towards those who believe.” We also ask Allah to be pleased with those who did not participate like Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Ibn ‘Umar, Muḥammad ibn Maslamah, Sa’id ibn Zayd and others. In addition to this, we disassociate ourselves from the dissenting Khawārij who fought ‘Alī and declared both parties disbelievers.

Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Fath* (13/37):

Ahl al-Sunnah is unanimous on the obligation to refrain from any defamatory remarks about any of the Ṣaḥābah on account of what transpired between them even if he knows which of the two parties was on the right position; since they did not fight those wars except that it was

on account of their ijtihād and Allah has pardoned the one who errs in his ijtihād. In fact it has been established that he will receive a single reward and that the one who is correct in his ijtihād will receive a double-reward.

These quotations from the scholars are one a drop in the ocean of what has been written about this matter. Perhaps what has been transmitted of them will satisfy one who is seeking the truth and does not follow his own desires.

And with Allah is all success.